

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I do not think there is anything but precedent, which sometimes is "better honored in the breach than in the observance," to justify an adjournment until to-morrow. The present session of the Senate has an enormous docket before it. Every day should count, every day must count, if we are to transact any considerable percentage of the business confronting us. Personally, therefore, I protest against the proposed adjournment.

Mr. CUMMINS. Under the circumstances I do not want to do anything that could be possibly construed as disrespectful to the President, and it is only because I felt that a disregard of a custom of many years might be construed as disrespect to the President that I said what I have.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I wish to suggest to the Senator from Iowa that the railroad bill is now the unfinished business, and therefore there could be no disrespect to the President if we went on with the unfinished business. I hope the Senate will remain in session for that purpose.

Mr. THOMAS. I wish to add, Mr. President, if I may, that inasmuch as we have had a long extra session of Congress, while this is the first regular session, it does not find us in the position which the Senate would occupy if there had been no such extra session. I think if there had been no extra session it would be perfectly proper—perhaps the proprieties would require—that we should adjourn until we heard from the President. Under the present circumstances I do not see that any disrespect or discourtesy is involved in our proceeding to the discharge of the business that is before us. We are sent here to transact business. We have transacted very little of it since last May. If the present session is to be drawn out in the same way we shall perhaps adjourn some time next September with very little behind us to show for our work.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I wish to say, in addition to what I have already said, that I am quite ready to go on at this or any other moment at which the Senate will be willing to take up the bill; and if the Senate feels that it should not adjourn until a later hour in the afternoon, it will be entirely agreeable to me.

Mr. LODGE. I made the motion to adjourn in accordance with, I think, the unbroken custom to take a recess or adjourn on the first day of the session until the committee appointed to notify the President that Congress was ready to do business and receive any communication he might be pleased to make had performed its duty. The House, of course, joins with us in that action. The President is ill. I should be extremely sorry, personally, if anything were done which could be construed into any disrespect to him. For that reason I made the motion. If the Senate sees fit to vote the motion down, of course I shall bow to the will of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understood that the Senator withheld the motion. Does he make it now?

Mr. LODGE. I make the motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD]. In his absence I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] and am, therefore, compelled to withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. I understand that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN], with whom I have a pair, has not voted. I transfer my pair with that Senator to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] and vote "yea."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX]. I transfer my pair to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. WATSON (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT]. I transfer my pair to my colleague the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] and permit my vote to stand.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN],

and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] are absent on account of illness.

I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK] with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON];

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK];

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]; and

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. GAY. I desire to announce that my colleague the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL] is necessarily absent from the Senate.

Mr. GERRY. I wish to announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], and the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] are necessarily absent from the Senate.

I wish also to announce that the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are absent on public business.

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 12, as follows:

YEAS—44.

Asburt	Elkins	McKellar	Sheppard
Ball	France	Moses	Simmons
Bankhead	Gay	Myers	Smith, Ga.
Beckham	Gerry	Nelson	Smoot
Borah	Hale	Newberry	Spencer
Brandeggee	Harris	Norris	Stanley
Calder	Hitchcock	Page	Swanson
Chamberlain	Johnson, Calif.	Phipps	Townsend
Colt	Kling	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Culberson	La Follette	Pomerene	Warren
Dial	Lodge	Reed	Watson

NAYS—12.

Cummins	Fletcher	Kellogg	Sutherland
Curtis	Frelinghuysen	Keyes	Thomas
Edge	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Wadsworth

NOT VOTING—39.

Capper	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Smith, Ariz.
Dillingham	Kendrick	Overman	Smith, Md.
Fall	Kenyon	Owen	Smith, S. C.
Fernald	Kirby	Penrose	Sterling
Gore	Knox	Pelan	Trammell
Gronna	Lenroot	Poinexter	Underwood
Harding	McCormick	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Harrison	McCumber	Robinson	Williams
Henderson	McLean	Sherman	Wolcott
Johnson, S. Dak.	McNary	Shields	

So the motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, December 2, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Monday, December 1, 1919.

This being the day fixed by the Constitution of the United States for the annual meeting of the Congress of the United States, the House of Representatives of the Sixty-sixth Congress, having been duly organized at the extra session beginning May 19 last, met in its Hall at 12 o'clock m. for the first regular session, and was called to order by the Speaker, Hon. FREDERICK H. GILLET, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father Almighty, in the swift flight of time Thou hast brought us to the beginning of the first regular session of the Sixty-sixth Congress.

The past has gone save for the results which have been woven into the tissues of our Republic. The future looms large before it, questions of great moment must be solved, hence our hearts turn to Thee for guidance.

Imbue the Speaker of this House and each Representative with wisdom, strength, courage, fortitude, that they may think deeply, act nobly, do justly, and meet the tasks before them with courageous hearts and leave behind them a record worthy of American statesmen, and thus add solidity, strength, and greater achievements to our Government; and all praise we will ascribe to Thee, in the name and spirit of the Master. Amen.

CALL OF THE ROLL.

The roll was called by States, and the following Members answered to their names:

ALABAMA.
Fred L. Blackmon.
J. Thomas Heflin.
William A. Oldfield.
John N. Tillman.
Clarence F. Lea.
John E. Baker.
Charles F. Curry.
William N. Vaile.
Charles B. Timberlake.
Augustine Lonergan.
John Q. Tilson.
Herbert J. Drane.
Frank Park.
Charles R. Crisp.
William C. Wright.
William D. Upshaw.
William W. Larsen.
Burton L. French.
Martin B. Madden.
James R. Mann.
William W. Wilson.
John W. Rainey.
Adolph J. Sabath.
James McAndrews.
Niels Junn.
Thomas Gallagher.
Carl R. Chindblom.
Ira C. Copley.
James W. Dunbar.
John S. Benham.
Richard N. Elliott.
Merrill Moores.
Charles A. Kennedy.
Harry E. Hull.
James W. Good.
Edward C. Little.
Philip P. Campbell.
David H. Kincheleo.
Robert Y. Thomas, jr.
A. B. Rouse.
John T. Watkins.
Riley J. Wilson.
Wallace H. White, jr.
John A. Peters.
Charles P. Coady.
J. Charles Linthicum.
Allen T. Treadway.
Frederick H. Gillett.
Calvin D. Paige.
Willfred W. Larkin.
Michael F. Phelan.
Frederick W. Dallinger.
Frank E. Doremus.
Earl C. Michener.
Carl E. Mapes.
Sydney Anderson.
Charles R. Davis.
Oscar E. Keller.
Walter H. Newton.
Hubert D. Stephens.
Milton A. Romjue.
William W. Rucker.
Clement C. Dickinson.
William L. Nelson.
Champ Clark.
John M. Evans.
Robert E. Evans.
Melvin O. McLaughlin.

ARIZONA.
Carl Hayden.

ARKANSAS.
Otis Wingo.

CALIFORNIA.
Charles H. Randall.
William Kettner.

COLORADO.
Guy U. Hardy.
Edward T. Taylor.

CONNECTICUT.
James P. Glynn.

DELAWARE.
Caleb R. Layton.

FLORIDA.
Frank Clark.

GEORGIA.
Gordon Lee.
Thomas M. Bell.
Carl Vinson.
William C. Lanckford.

IDAHO.
Addison T. Smith.

ILLINOIS.
Charles E. Fuller.
John C. McKenzie.
William J. Graham.
Clifford Ireland.
Joseph G. Cannon.
William B. McKinley.
William A. Rodenberg.
Edwin B. Brooks.
Thomas S. Williams.
Richard Yates.

INDIANA.
Albert H. Vestal.
Fred S. Purnell.
William R. Wood.
Milton Kraus.

IOWA.
Horace M. Towner.
William R. Green.

KANSAS.
J. N. Tincher.

KENTUCKY.
James C. Cantrill.
William J. Fields.

LOUISIANA.
Ladislav Lazaro.
James B. Aswell.

MAINE.
Ira G. Hersey.

MARYLAND.
Frederick N. Zihlman.

MASSACHUSETTS.
Peter F. Tague.
George Holden Tinkham.
James A. Gallivan.
Robert Luce.
William S. Greene.
Joseph Walsh.

MICHIGAN.
Patrick H. Kelley.
Louis C. Cramton.
Gilbert A. Currie.

MINNESOTA.
William L. Carrs.
Halvor Steenerson.
Thomas D. Schall.

MISSISSIPPI.
Percy E. Quin.

MISSOURI.
Leonidas C. Dyer.
Marion E. Rhodes.
Edw. D. Hays.
Isaac V. McPherson.
Cleveland Newton.

MONTANA.
Carl W. Riddick.

NEBRASKA.
William E. Andrews.
Moses P. Kinkaid.

William J. Browning.
Isaac Bacharach.
Elijah C. Hutchinson.
Ernest R. Ackerman.
John R. Ramsey.

Frederick C. Hicks.
Chas. Pope Caldwell.
John MacCrate.
Thomas H. Cullen.
John B. Johnston.
James P. Maher.
William E. Cleary.
David J. O'Connell.
Reuben L. Haskell.
Daniel J. Riordan.
Henry M. Gohfogie.
Christopher B. Sullivan.
Fiorello H. LaGuardia.
Peter J. Dooling.

Claude Kitchin.
Samuel M. Rinson.
Edward W. Pou.

John M. Baer.

Warren Gard.
Benjamin F. Welty.
Simeon D. Fess.
Isaac R. Sherwood.
Israel M. Foster.
Edwin D. Ricketts.

Everette B. Howard.
William W. Hastings.
Charles D. Carter.

Willis C. Hawley.
Nicholas J. Sinnott.

William S. Vane.
J. Hampton Moore.
George W. Edmonds.
Peter E. Costello.
George P. Darrow.
Henry W. Watson.
W. W. Griest.
Patrick McLane.
John J. Casey.
Arthur G. Dewalt.
Louis T. McFadden.
Edgar R. Kiess.

Richard S. Whaley.
James F. Hyman.
Fred H. Dominick.
Samuel J. Nicholls.

Charles A. Christopherson.
Royal C. Johnson.

Sam R. Sells.
John A. Moon.
Cordell Hull.
Ewin L. Davis.
Joseph W. Byrns.

John C. Box.
Sam Rayburn.
James P. Buchanan.
Tom Connally.

Milton H. Welling.

Schuyler Otis Bland.
Edward E. Holland.
Walter A. Watson.
James P. Woods.

Albert Johnson.

M. M. Neely.
Stuart F. Reed.

Clifford E. Randall.
John C. Kleczka.
Florian Lampert.

NEVADA.
Charles R. Evans.
NEW HAMPSHIRE.
Sherman E. Burroughs.
NEW JERSEY.

Amos H. Radcliffe.
Cornelius A. McGlennon.
Daniel F. Minahan.
Frederick R. Lehlbach.

NEW YORK.

Thomas F. Smith.
Herbert C. Pell.
Isaac Siegel.
James V. Ganly.
James W. Husted.
Edmund Platt.
Rollin B. Sanford.
Frank Crowther.
Bertrand H. Snell.
Luther W. Mott.
Walter W. Magee.
Alanson B. Houghton.
Clarence MacGregor.
Daniel A. Reed.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Hannibal L. Godwin.
Robert L. Doughton.

NORTH DAKOTA.

George M. Young.

OHIO.

James T. Begg.
William A. Ashbrook.
Charles A. Mooney.
John J. Babka.
Henry I. Emerson.

OKLAHOMA.

John W. Harreld.
Dick T. Morgan.

OREGON.

Clifton N. McArthur.

PENNSYLVANIA.

John M. Rose.
Edward S. Brooks.
Samuel A. Kendall.
Henry W. Temple.
Milton W. Shreve.
Nathan L. Strong.
Willis J. Hulings.
Stephen G. Porter.
M. Clyde Kelly.
Guy E. Campbell.
Thomas S. Crago.
Anderson H. Walters.

RHODE ISLAND.
Walter R. Stiness.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

William F. Stevenson.
Philip H. Stoll.
Edward C. Mann.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Harry L. Gandy.

TENNESSEE.

Lemuel P. Padgett.
Theus W. Shas.
Finis J. Garrett.
Hubert F. Fisher.

TEXAS.

Fritz G. Lanham.
Lucian W. Parrish.
John N. Garner.
Thomas L. Blanton.

UTAH.

James H. Mays.

VERMONT.

Frank L. Greene.

VIRGINIA.

R. Walton Moore.
C. Bascom Slomp.
Henry D. Flood.

WASHINGTON.

John W. Summers.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Harry C. Woodyard.
Wells Goodykoontz.

WISCONSIN.

Edward E. Browne.
James A. Frear.
Adolphus P. Nelson.

WYOMING.

Frank W. Mondell.

ALASKA.

George B. Grigsby.

HAWAII.
J. Kuhio Kalaniana'ole.
PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.
Teodoro R. Yangco.
PORTO RICO.
Felix Cordova Davila.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk reports the presence of 269 Members, more than a quorum.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Sanderson, Secretary of the Senate, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

Also:

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House is assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

And that in compliance with the foregoing resolution the Vice President had appointed as said committee Mr. LODGE and Mr. HITCHCOCK.

NOTIFICATION TO THE SENATE.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution.
The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House inform the Senate that a quorum of the House of Representatives has appeared and that the House is ready to proceed with business.

The resolution was agreed to.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I present the following resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.
The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of three Members be appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with the committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House is assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good], and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN].

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Dudley, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9821) to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the Metropolitan police of the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1901, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following resolution:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the time within which the Joint Select Committee on the Pilgrim Tercentenary shall report is hereby further extended to January 10, 1920.

DAILY HOUR OF MEETING.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.
The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That until otherwise ordered the hour of daily meeting of the House of Representatives shall be 12 o'clock meridian.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BRIGGS, for one week, on account of important business.

To Mr. STRONG of Kansas, for one week, on account of important business.

To Mr. HOCH, for one week, on account of important business.

To Mr. McKEOWN, for three days, on account of illness.

To Mr. GRIFFIN, on account of illness.

To Mr. NOLAN, indefinitely, on account of important business.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask indefinite leave of absence on behalf of my colleague, Mr. FAIRFIELD, on account of illness.

There was no objection.

CALENDAR FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

The SPEAKER. This is Monday, Unanimous Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill upon the calendar.

HOMESTEAD ENTRIES WITHIN THE FORMER FORT PECK INDIAN RESERVATION, MONT.

The first business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 183) providing additional time for the payment of purchase money under homestead entries of lands within the former Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill was passed over on one or two previous calls of the calendar.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Twice at my request.

Mr. WALSH. I should like a little additional information, if somebody is in a position to give it, in addition to that which is contained in the report, as to why this Fort Peck Indian Reservation should be treated a little differently in respect to the time for the payment of the purchase money?

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the situation is this: The Fort Peck Indian Reservation is a strip of territory in northern Montana opened five or six years ago to homestead entry and under the appraised value of the land, ranging, as I understand, from \$2 to \$10. In other words, the homesteader complies with the homestead law and pays for the land in addition and the payments go to the Indians. Now, for three years they have had an unprecedented drought there and the people have simply not been able to make their payments and comply with the conditions of the homestead law, and this provides for an extension of time in which to make their payments, the people paying interest in advance on their payments for a period of two years.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, the gentleman appreciates that Montana is not the only State in the Union that is subject to droughts, and why pass a special law for special conditions? I did not understand that when we legislated in reference to the payment of purchase price on these reservations for homesteads that we were taking into consideration the weather. It seems to me if these people have been unfortunate enough to locate on reservations where they have unfavorable weather conditions, they ought to try to make the best of it without coming in here and asking Congress to follow the weather.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Well, I think in a way the gentleman is right, and I would not be captious about the matter, but I recall three or four years ago there was a bad fire in Massachusetts and Congress appropriated money to take care of the people up there for the time being.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; and the gentleman will recollect that the Massachusetts people appropriated a great deal more than they asked from the Federal Congress. There is nothing here to show whether the State has been asked to do anything or any other agency except to say that the weather has prevented them from farming this reservation and making money enough to make their payments.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. It so happens it does. If these people were homesteaders pure and simple it would be different, but they are paying the Indians for the land also. These people are paying for it in advance by giving a two years' extension of time.

Mr. WALSH. If I understand the gentleman correctly, unless these people are given relief what they have there will be lost?

Mr. EVANS of Montana. They will have lost all the improvements of their land and lost everything because they simply can not remain there and live. They can not live upon that barren territory without relief, and they would have to go away and abandon their homesteads.

Mr. FRENCH. May I suggest that a similar case was acted favorably upon in northern Idaho just a few years ago, and then another thing we should bear in mind is that the money that these settlers pay does not go to the Government, but goes to the Indians. It belongs to the Indians, and, more than that—

Mr. WALSH. Of course, the Indians have no money anywhere.

Mr. FRENCH. This will be held in trust for the Indians by the Government, and they will receive a higher rate of interest from the farmers than would be allowed to them from the Government for the trust fund. I think it is to the interest of the Indians that the extension be made as much as to the settlers.

Mr. WALSH. Financially?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman permit me to ask why it is this bill went to the Committee on the Public Lands instead

of to the Committee on Indian Affairs, if the Indians are interested in this money?

Mr. EVANS of Montana. I can not say why it went there. It seems to have come from the Committee on Public Lands of the Senate and went to the Committee on the Public Lands of the House.

Mr. HASTINGS. If these are public lands and the Indians are interested in them, it occurs to me that this bill when it came from the Senate should have been referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs rather than to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. I know that a similar bill passed the Senate last session and went to the Public Lands Committee, and was favorably reported in the House.

Mr. HASTINGS. Does this bill provide for payment of interest to the Indians?

Mr. EVANS of Montana. The money is paid into the hands of the Government and is placed to the credit of the Indians, because it was originally Indian land.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will permit, I want to ask the gentleman from Montana if it is not a fact that in some of these cases the payments are due not only for one year but due for two or three years back?

Mr. EVANS of Montana. I think none of them are due for three years, but possibly some of them are due for two years.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, at the same time there was a drought in the State of Montana there was an unprecedented drought in Colorado and New Mexico and part of Idaho and in the greater portion of Texas, lasting in the last-named State three years, and the people of the State of Texas saw fit, when they could not get help elsewhere, to provide help for the people who needed it themselves. What has Montana done, if anything, in that respect?

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that Montana has done anything in this particular case. I do know that the Government of the United States provided money with which to take care of the stockmen and people living in the drought-stricken districts of Texas last year.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, no. All it did was this, that the Treasury placed money on deposit in certain national banks, and the Government was protected for every dollar it placed there. It placed money on deposit in certain national banks in Texas, and the banks themselves loaned money to the cattlemen. The Government did not pay out money itself to the stockmen, but only furnished credit to the banks.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. The Government here is only allowing some people who have made a contract with the Government to pay some money to the Indians. It is just a question now of whether or not you have foreclosed the mortgage under these adverse circumstances.

Mr. BLANTON. If this extension is granted, is there any hope that they will ultimately pay the land out?

Mr. EVANS of Montana. They think so, because they ask for this extension. If they do not get it they will lose their money and the land.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAMTON. Is there any time specified in this bill within which these people must avail themselves of the privilege given as to payments now past due?

Mr. EVANS of Montana. It is to extend the payment for a years that is past due, and then give them an opportunity in that time to have a further extension of one year. The payments are due, and the Government says they must make their payments now or take advantage of the extension.

Mr. CRAMTON. There is nothing in the bill fixing the time in which they must pay?

Mr. EVANS of Montana. I think not.

Mr. CRAMTON. Further, I note it appears that while in other extensions the interest shall be paid in advance, in this case even the interest which these parties must pay, according to the bill, does not have to be paid at the time the extension is granted. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to allow them additional time without limit for the payment of even the interest.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. I think the gentleman is in error.

Mr. CRAMTON. The language of the bill is "by paying interest at the rate of 5 per cent per annum * * * within such time as may be prescribed for that purpose by the Secretary of the Interior." Would the gentleman be agreeable to an amendment that would specify that these people must, within the specified time of 30 or 60 days from the taking effect of this act, take advantage of it, if they desire to do so, and, further, that at the time they make application for such extension of time they make their payment of interest?

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Yes; I would be willing to accept such an amendment.

Mr. CRAMTON. Or something of that kind?

Mr. EVANS of Montana. I am perfectly sure it is the intention of the authors of the bill to provide that the interest shall be paid in advance. No extension is made until interest is paid.

Mr. CRAMTON. The language is quite different. I think from the reading of the language of the bill that the gentleman will admit it reads like the department drew it. That is just the worst thing I can say about it, because they turn out bad pieces of legislation down there. But I would much prefer such an amendment. If the gentleman is agreeable to it I will not object to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, what is the necessity for enacting legislation based upon a need arising out of drought conditions there which will render similar legislation in the future unnecessary? In line 16, page 2, the bill says that "any payments so extended may thereafter be extended for a period of one year in like manner." It seems to me this opens wide the door for future extensions of time.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. I think the intention is to make it possible to extend these payments for two years, not for one year, a second extension making it two years.

Mr. ANDERSON. The reason for that is that they are one year behind now.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Yes; they are one year behind now.

Mr. WALSH. This language permits that now.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. I think not.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The language permits an extension for a hundred years. And it may be proper, too.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, if the gentleman admits it is proper, the bill should come in here as a general extension bill and not seek to come in here for one year on account of drought conditions.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That may be true, but here is the actual situation: This bill was introduced before the drought this year was so bad.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. They want an extension of time regardless of this year.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Now, along comes the drought this year in Montana, which, I suppose from the newspaper reports, is the worst they have ever had out there.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. The worst in 50 years.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Here is a bill that proposes to extend the time of payment one year upon the payment of interest. But that time would have expired, I think, the first of this year, practically, in most cases. They can not make that payment owing to the drought this year. Now, this other provision would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to extend the time another year.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. And it authorizes him indefinitely. If they have a drought another year they would need that extension. Of course it does leave to the administrative officer of the Government who deals with land the authority to extend the time of payment in this particular case from year to year upon the payment of 5 per cent interest. As a rule, however, the administrative officers of the Government are not very specially tender to the interests of these settlers, and I have no doubt they will be required to pay the money if there is a possible chance to squeeze any juice out of a dry orange. That is what these men are out there now—practically dry oranges.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Practically that is so.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. After the drought.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Well, the proviso beginning on line 16, as the gentleman will notice, permits an extension for any other reason than a drought.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Undoubtedly.

Mr. WALSH. And more than one extension.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Now, it seems to me, if this is a bill to take care of drought conditions, we ought not to embark upon general legislation to take care of all sorts of contingencies.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Of course this only applies to one particular reservation. I am not sure but there ought to be a general provision of law covering this subject. I do not believe that the Government should invite or permit citizens of the United States to go upon these dry lands and then exact the last penny from them if they fail to make the payments on it. No private individual would do that. We grant extensions of

time all over the United States everywhere to people who have borrowed money from private individuals. If you borrow money from the Farm Loan Board you have—what is it? Forty years—

Mr. PLATT. Thirty-four years—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. In which to pay it back. These people who go upon these lands, it goes without saying, have not a great deal of money or they would not go on the land, and when they go on the land to farm under the very hardest kind of conditions, and along comes nature and makes it impossible for them to meet the payments required by law, what harm is there, instead of taking away what they have put upon the land, thus sending them to the poorhouse, or practically that elsewhere, in giving an extension of time to them upon a rate of interest which is higher than the Government pays to the Indians if they have paid the money into the Federal Treasury?

Mr. RIDDICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. RIDDICK. There is one point in connection with this bill that ought to be made clear, in my judgment. These settlers went upon this land a few years ago when weather conditions were good, and at that time they thought they could make their payments nicely. Many of them invested their whole life savings in improvements upon these lands, and now if they lose them they lose not only the lands but the improvements on the lands in which they have invested their life savings and which they have placed there. Montana has had three successive years of drought in this community. The banks have made generous loans, and the counties in Montana have made liberal loans and rendered aid in the way of seeds and other things, and the State itself has been generous to these settlers; but in spite of that, after three years of drought, the settlers find themselves unable to make their payments, and under the provisions of the law the Government is bound to take this land away from the settlers and turn it back to the Indians. I do not think the Indians want to see that done, and I do not think Congress wants to do that. I think they ought to have time to work their way out.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. These lands, as I understand, are on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation?

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Yes, sir.

Mr. CARTER. They have been so ever since the unallotted lands were sold?

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. How does it happen that the bill goes to the Committee on the Public Lands?

Mr. EVANS of Montana. That question was asked by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS]; I do not know.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious this bill should have gone to the Committee on Indian Affairs. It has no business with the Committee on the Public Lands. Since it deals with the sale of unallotted Indian lands the Committee on Indian Affairs certainly has jurisdiction.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, of course this bill was referred at the desk. A Member of the House introduces a bill, and it is a common practice for the Member to indicate on the bill the committee to which he thinks it should be referred. That indication is, of course, not binding on the one who makes the reference.

Mr. CARTER. I understand that.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. But this is a Senate bill, and there is no indication as to what committee it should be referred to. On the face of the bill, both the title and the substance of the bill would lead a person not familiar with the particular facts relating to the bill to suppose that it belonged to the Committee on the Public Lands. Now, it is the duty of the Committee on Indian Affairs to keep track of all of these bills that are referred, and it was the duty, theoretically at least, of the gentleman from Oklahoma, the former chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, or some one else on that committee, to suggest to the House that this bill belonged to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. CARTER. I am suggesting that now.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Such a reference or change of reference would have been made without objection. Of course, the Committee on Indian Affairs does not lose jurisdiction. I think myself that it should have been sent to the Committee on Indian Affairs, but it was not through anybody's fault.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman from Illinois knows that there are about 20,000 to 35,000 bills introduced during every Congress. When I was chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs I did undertake to look after the bills that, with proper reference,

should have been referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, but I found it a pretty difficult task to go through all of these bills, as the gentleman knows. I assume that one thing which did happen here was that when this reference was made in the Senate it was referred to the Committee on Public Lands. When it came over to the House the clerk at the desk, having noted that reference in the Senate, naturally referred it to the Committee on the Public Lands in the House. I do not charge anyone with any blame, but I want to say that in the future when these bills come on the floor of the House they must come through the front door, and all bills over which the Indian Committee has jurisdiction must have appropriate consideration by such committee. I understand the urgent necessity for the passage of this bill and shall not object to its consideration at this time, but I want to serve notice that hereafter bills belonging to committees of which I am a member must be reported properly from those committees or I shall feel obliged to object to consideration by unanimous consent.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, in regard to the jurisdiction, I desire to call attention to the fact that a great many of these bills have gone to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Mr. CARTER. That does not make it right.

Mr. STEENERSON. Bills for the payment of money out of the ceded Indian lands have been referred to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Mr. CARTER. They should not be.

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes, they should, for the reason that the Committee on Indian Affairs has no jurisdiction in these matters when the act is proposed to cede the land to the United States—

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman is mistaken about this bill; there is no land ceded to the United States; the land was sold for the Indians by the Interior Department and the money paid into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indian tribe.

Mr. STEENERSON. The act is analogous to the cession of land in other States where lands are opened to homestead entry upon a certain amount due the Indians, and that is administered by the Committee on the Public Lands.

Mr. CARTER. That may be true; but these were Indian lands and have been ever since they were set aside for a reservation. It is true that the homestead procedure was made to apply, but the lands were sold by the Government for the Indians, the money when collected goes to the credit of the Indians, it is administered on by the Indian Bureau, and must eventually be distributed among the Indians or used for their benefit. These Indians may be in more destitute straits than the homesteaders, they may need these very payments even worse than the settlers. Now, who can best give that information, the Public Lands Committee or the Committee on Indian Affairs? There is no reason on earth why this bill should ever have gone to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Mr. STEENERSON. In Minnesota and the public-land States the ceded Indian lands are administered by the General Land Office.

Mr. CARTER. Certainly; but the only thing in question here is the payment of the funds, and to whom do the funds belong when paid? They are due the Indians; they do not go into the Treasury fund but are paid into the Treasury as an Indian fund, to be distributed among the Indians. The Committee on the Public Lands does not have anything to do with Indian affairs, and they could not know what the Indians need. They could not tell the House whether the Indians need the money. If this had been looked into by the proper committee, it might have been demonstrated that the Indians need the money right now.

Mr. STEENERSON. They would not get it.

Mr. JUUL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. JUUL. A short while ago we were debating a bill on the floor that provided that the settlers might lease lands, and they had to go out and do day's labor in order to make repayment. The crops were a failure, and we have this situation which has been disclosed here to-day.

Now, these men are not interested as to whether this bill should go to the Committee on the Public Lands or the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. CARTER. But Members of Congress are interested in it.

Mr. JUUL. They are sitting out there in a drought-stricken piece of territory.

Mr. CARTER. I think I can cut this conversation short by repeating that I am not going to object to this bill, but I expect in the future to object to all such irregular and unsafe procedure.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama demands the regular order. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of this bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That any person who has made homestead entry under the provisions of the act of Congress approved May 30, 1908 (35 Stat. L., 558), entitled "An act for the survey and allotment of lands now embraced within the limits of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana, and the sale and disposal of all the surplus lands after allotment," may obtain an extension of time for one year from the anniversary of the date of entry last preceding the passage of this act within which to pay the one-half of the installment then due or such part of any preceding installment, where payment has not yet been made and where an extension of time therefor is not authorized by the act of Congress approved March 2, 1917 (39 Stat. L., 994), by paying interest at the rate of 5 per cent per annum on the sums to be extended from the maturity of the unpaid installments to the expiration of the period of extension, the interest to be paid to the receiver of the land office for the district in which the lands are situated, within such time as may be prescribed for that purpose by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That the one-half of any installment which becomes due within one year from the passage of this act and for which an extension of time for payment is not authorized by the said act of March 2, 1917, may also be extended for a period of one year by paying interest thereon in advance at the said rate: *Provided further*, That any payment so extended may thereafter be extended for a period of one year in like manner: *And provided further*, That if commutation proof is submitted, all the unpaid payments must be made at that time.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to section 1.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CRAMTON moves to strike out in lines 9 and 10, page 2, the words "within such time as may be prescribed for that purpose by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*," and insert in lieu thereof "*Provided*, That in order to secure such extension application therefor must be made within 90 days from the time this act takes effect and the said interest shall be tendered with the application: *Provided further*."

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the amendment. This amendment provides that these people shall make this payment within 90 days from the passage of this act. It is now midwinter with those people and probably a good many of them are off the land. They have been driven off by stress of weather conditions. They may not know this act has been passed or have opportunity to know anything about the proposition. It appears to me that if an amendment should be offered it should be within 90 days after the receipt of notice about the matter, that the Secretary should notify them in some way or other. It would be manifestly—

Mr. JUUL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. EVANS of Montana. I will.

Mr. JUUL. What would happen if the notice came and they did not have any money?

Mr. EVANS of Montana. They simply could not make the payment, of course.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, of course the gentleman will recall this matter has been called to his attention before unanimous consent was granted, and I felt that in some form the gentleman should accept an amendment. It would seem to me hardly reasonable to put the matter in the form in which the gentleman has suggested, placing the burden of notice upon the Interior Department. If the gentleman would prefer to have it six months—I take it that these people are in no danger of losing their rights, they are interested in this legislation, they have Representatives in Congress who are interested in looking after their affairs, and certainly they will have notice as to the passage of the legislation. Now, if the gentleman thinks six months is better for the people than three months, I have no objection.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. I should prefer it be left as it is.

Mr. CRAMTON. It seems to me there should be some time limit, and that when they do make application the interest charge should accompany it.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Personally I think it ought to be left to the Secretary of the Interior to notify these people, within 30, 60, 90 days, or whatever it is, depending upon the conditions and circumstances at the time existing.

Mr. CRAMTON. This legislation, even with the gentleman's support, will probably not become a law before some time in the winter, and a period of six months will carry it well into next year. If I may have unanimous consent I will ask unanimous consent to vary my amendment and make it a period of six months instead of three months.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment so as to make it six months instead of three months. Is there objection?

Mr. CURRY of California. Mr. Speaker, I object. This is a Senate bill, and it passed the Senate, and I object to any amendment—

Mr. CRAMTON. I will ask, then, that the amendment be defeated, and I will offer a different amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the same amendment changing the 90 days to 6 months.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, lines 9 and 10, amend by striking out the words "within such time as may be prescribed for that purpose by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided*, That in order to secure such extension application therefor must be made within six months from the time this act takes effect and the said interest shall be tendered with the application: *Provided further*."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, in connection with this amendment I only want to say that I have no interest in the matter, but it would seem to me desirable that this should be put in a definite form. When the bill came before the House and before unanimous consent was granted I called the matter to the attention of the House and interrogated the gentleman from Montana having charge of the bill, and he expressed his willingness to accept some form of amendment, and by reason of that fact I withheld any objection which I otherwise would have made to the consideration of the bill. Now, this being a Senate bill, the adoption of this amendment will not endanger the bill or materially delay it. It will go to the Senate, and I have no doubt that the amendment will be promptly accepted and the matter disposed of. Hence I feel I am warranted in offering the amendment and asking for its adoption.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. What gain is there to come from this amendment? What are we to expect, what benefit, and to whom?

Mr. CRAMTON. In the first place, the bill is so obscurely drawn that it would seem very difficult for the department to know what course they should take in enforcing it. There is no time limit. These men may in 10 years from now make this application and may be entitled to a hearing. There is nothing in the bill to limit the time within which they shall make this application. If the gentleman will permit, if a definite time is fixed, then the department will wait the running of that time before they take any steps to disturb these people in the possession of the property, and in six months, as the amendment suggests, they are secured from any difficulty whatever. So it is, in the first place, for the aid of the department, in order that they may know how to handle the matter, and next it is for the aid of the people on the land, because without some such definite provision the department might feel that after 30 days the parties had had enough time and might proceed to dispossess them. It is to the interest of the people as well to have a period within which they are protected. Furthermore, you are denying the Indians the payment of the principal to which they are entitled, and then you have a provision in the bill here that says that the Secretary of the Interior may postpone for 10 years, if he chooses, the time within which that interest shall be paid. And I feel those things should be fixed in the bill.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. If there is anybody on earth that has a hard time it is the homesteader in a dry country. He may not feel the need of making an application at this time, or within 30 days, or 60 days, or 90 days, or even 6 months, but in 7 months the times may change, and you are going to limit it so that the Secretary of the Interior can not take care of his case.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman knows that the only people who will be limited to the six months are those who are already in arrears. If they do not know yet that they need the extension they can not need it very badly. As to the further extensions, then the Secretary is authorized to grant them, and there is nothing in my amendment to affect those.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The effect of your amendment would strike out the further extension entirely.

Mr. CRAMTON. That is not the intention.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. But that is the effect.

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not agree with the gentleman, because the bill, down to line 10 on page 2, has to do entirely with pay-

ments that are now past due, and it stipulates the payment of interest, and so forth, and then goes on to say that that interest, which it has been discussing in the first part of page 2, shall be paid "within such time as may be prescribed for that purpose by the Secretary of the Interior." Then we go on and have the proviso:

That the one-half of any installment which becomes due within one year from the passage of this act, and for which an extension of time for payment is not authorized by the said act of March 2, 1917, may also be extended for a period of one year—

And so forth. None of that is stricken out. It remains in the bill.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I know that the provision—

Provided further, That any payment so extended may thereafter be extended for a period of one year in like manner.

Would include with it the amendment of the gentleman, which would mean, although you wanted application to extend for another year, you have got to make the application to pay the interest within six months of the passage of this act, which, of course, would be impossible, as the time would not exist.

Now, I would like to say a word about the gentleman's amendment. Mr. Speaker, this bill was originally introduced in the last Congress, and the favorable report was made upon it April 27, 1918. That is nearly two years ago. At that time the department believed it was desirable to extend the time of payment to these homestead settlers. Nearly two years have passed away since that time, and two of the hardest years probably that have ever been known in this part of Montana. These settlers have not recuperated within this two years' time. They will not be able to make the payment promptly, if this bill passes, within one year's time. They will need a further extension. Nobody will be injured by the Government granting them the further extension of time. The Indians will not get any more money by taking this land away from these homesteaders and giving it to somebody else. The Government will not benefit by taking the land away from these homesteaders. The interest of everybody is conserved and benefited by having these people keep these lands, if it be possible to do so.

Now, this bill, which was drawn two years ago, authorizes, in the first instance, the extension of one year. That is direct. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], who is very careful about these land bills and who deserves commendation for his care concerning them, offers an amendment which will require application for the extension to be accompanied by the interest and to be presented within six months of the passage of the act. That will not authorize an extension next year. The Secretary is only authorized to grant an extension for one year at a time, and if, under the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan, a man makes an application now for extension and pays his interest, then he can not get a further extension, because he can not make his application and pay the interest for the next extension within six months from the passage of the act. Nor do I see any occasion for Congress endeavoring to specify exactly when the interest shall be paid. The legislation is to give these men an opportunity to extend their rights upon these lands if they pay 5 per cent interest. They make the application and the Secretary determines when they shall pay the interest. I do not see why we should undertake to say just when they will pay it. One man may be able to pay it to-day and another man may be able to borrow money and pay it six months from now.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. GARD. Is not the provision which the gentleman has referred to, on lines 16 and 17, extending payment for an additional year, the provision referred to by the Secretary when he says that this bill makes similar legislation unnecessary? Is not that a proper provision, and would it not be affected seriously by the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I think it would be affected very seriously by the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan, and I think it is a highly desirable provision in the bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. CRAMTON. Is not this the procedure? Certain settlers are in arrears; this bill is intended to give them the right to get from the Secretary of the Interior an extension of one year for the payment of certain sums. We will say that that sum became due the 1st of November last. This would enable the Interior Department to extend that time one year from the 1st of November. Now, I do not seek to change that, but I do seek to fix a time limit within which these settlers must move; that is, six months from the time this becomes a law, and that would be about the 1st of June or July. They make application, then, to the Interior Department for an extension of time, and thereupon

the Secretary gives them an extension of time from the 1st of November, running then until the next November. Then later the proviso in line 16 follows, that such payments having been extended, they may be extended afterwards for another year. That is a matter that would come up the 1st of November next year.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. But it says "in like manner."

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; in like manner; but in order to remove any question I would be glad to put this in as an amendment:

Insert after the word "extension," in the second line, the words "for payments now past due."

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I do not think the gentleman's amendment ought to go into the bill at all. I am perfectly frank about that.

Mr. CRAMTON. Let us remove this one difficulty that the gentleman calls attention to. In order to remove the objection I would be glad to put those words in.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I have no objection to having them inserted.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the words "for payments now past due" in my amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment of Mr. CRAMTON by inserting after the word "extension" in the second line the words "for payments now past due."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment as it will read when modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out, on line 9 and 10, page 2, the words "within such time as may be prescribed for that purpose by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*," and insert in lieu thereof "*Provided*, That in order to secure such extension for payments now past due application therefor must be made within 90 days from the time this act takes effect, and the said interest shall be tendered with the application: *Provided further*,"

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the language on page 2, lines 16 and 17.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH: Page 2, beginning with line 16, strike out the words:

Provided further, That any payments so extended may thereafter be extended for a period of one year in like manner."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced to cover an emergency arising out of drought conditions in this particular section of Montana. The language here would permit further extensions, not because of drought or emergency conditions of similar nature but for any reason whatever, and you are writing permanent legislation with reference to the time of payment for this particular Fort Peck Indian Reservation and giving them the privilege of having their time extended, which request was based upon drought conditions, and giving them the privilege of having the time extended for any reason whatever. To that extent you are giving them preference and rights not possessed by other homesteaders in other sections who may have perfectly good reasons for asking for an extension of time. They may not have experienced drought, but they may have had misfortunes which resulted in their not being able to realize on their crops. They may have had illness in their families, and there may be other reasons which prevent them from making payments, and yet they can not come under any sort of legislation and get an extension of time unless they come in and get a separate bill passed.

Now, I think if we grant these people an extension of time under this bill, as it is framed, we are doing all that is required under the circumstances, and I do not believe that under special legislation, depending upon special conditions, we should write a bill which, as the Assistant Secretary of the Interior says, will by its language take care not only of this situation but will render similar legislation in the future unnecessary, so far as these lands are concerned. I do not believe we ought to enact legislation, so far as these lands are concerned, granting the right of extension of time of payment; a right that is not possessed by any of the other Indian reservations which have been thrown open to homestead settlement, and for that reason I believe we would be justified, even upon the representation made here in the report of the committee and in the statements of those who have spoken in behalf of this bill, in eliminating

this language. If we are going to extend the time of these homesteaders let us enact a general law and provide for an extension of time and give the Secretary of the Interior or the parties having jurisdiction the discretion to grant general extensions.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Does not the gentleman from Massachusetts recognize that these homesteaders are having a very serious time of it? Does he not realize that they have not in the last three years grown enough on these homesteads to feed their families?

Mr. WALSH. That is true. I have listened to the testimony, and if we are to legislate in this manner let us turn this matter over to the Weather Bureau, so that when they have a drought payments will be made easy, and when they have a good season the terms of payment will be made harsh.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. This is a very serious matter. This is a life-and-death matter with these people. This is not a joke for the homesteader.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman answer me and say why we should treat these people any different because they have had a drought—and we are going to remedy that situation—why we should open the door to further extensions of time, not on account of drought conditions, but for any cause which they may present to the Secretary?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. That would be discretionary with the Secretary.

Mr. WALSH. Then why yield him the power to do it? If he is not going to do it, why pass the law? This was a special bill introduced in the Senate and passed there, based upon the fact that this drought had overtaken these settlers. We are all willing to pass this legislation to remedy that situation, but you are going far beyond that. You are granting this authority to extend the time for periods of one year, without limit, in such a manner as to make unnecessary any future legislation with reference to the extension of the time of payment. If you are going to grant that privilege of extension to the Fort Peck Indian Reservation on account of the drought and not on account of any other misfortune which this is particularly intended to cover, why not write a general law?

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt about a very trying situation in Montana, and I presume that under the circumstances we are fully justified in extending the time of payments on the Fort Peck Reservation for another year. They had a drought last summer, the most severe in all the history of that section. In answer to the suggestion of the gentleman from Massachusetts, I want to say that whatever the House may do—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the time of the gentleman from Massachusetts may be extended five minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. I want to say that whatever the House may do in regard to this bill I should certainly regret to have the policy proposed extended generally, and for this reason, that under this extraordinary policy we might develop a situation where very great areas of land would be permanently reserved from the payment of taxes. So long as the title to these lands remains in the Government—and it will remain in the Government until the payments are all made, I assume, although there is nothing in the bill to guard that—a condition may easily be created in which there would be a very considerable area of country in which there would never be any taxes paid.

Just how gentlemen expect they are going to be able to maintain schools, build roads, and care for the institutions of the Government under these conditions I do not know. In the country to which this law applies 5 per cent is a very low rate of interest. The average settler pays nearer 10 per cent on his ordinary loans. If he can secure a delay of payment indefinitely of the sums due on his land and pay only 5 per cent interest on the deferred payments, and thereby avoid the payment of taxes, he will continue that condition just as long as it is possible to do it. This kind of legislation may be satisfactory to the gentleman from Montana. I am somewhat surprised that the Committee on Public Lands has indorsed it. To me it seems the worst sort of legislation in connection with a situation like this, if it is to be followed generally or extensively, because it would create a condition under which we would have areas which never could be self-supporting, because

the land would not be subject to taxation. It seems to me that the present conditions of drought could be easily taken care of without legislation like this.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, has the gentleman from Wyoming consumed all of my time?

The SPEAKER. No; the gentleman from Massachusetts has two minutes remaining.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, in further support of this amendment I desire to say that, it seems to me, if we are going to extend the time beyond the period necessary to enable these men to make up the payments which have been defaulted because of the drought, it might have been done by so framing the language as to permit the extension because of drought conditions and the repetition of drought conditions which occasioned the default in payments. If it is unwise, as the gentleman from Wyoming states, to extend the time generally by a general law, I think it unwise to pick out one particular reservation because of a drought in that State and say that you can have an extension of one year on making such a showing as the public official may require, and say to other reservations that we can not extend your time because we are not authorized to extend the time of payment. Therefore I submit that this does not affect the remedial effect of the legislation at all by striking out this language. We permit them to take care of these settlers who have made default of payment because of the severe drought, and if you strike out the language I have indicated you simply say that Congress does not desire to embark on a policy of extension in the future for any reason that the settlers may set up.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts will not be agreed to. It would practically destroy the bill. After all, we are loaning, it is said, a great many million dollars to people over in Europe who need assistance. We are every day being asked to contribute funds for the purpose of putting up buildings, restoring villages and farms in territory which was devastated over there.

Now, here is a proposition to permit some man or woman who went into the dry territory of the country and endeavored to establish a home, under a homestead claim, for which they paid, or were to pay, but who met with conditions of nature beyond belief almost at the time. Here is a proposition for the Government to do what? To give them the land, to build them homes, to buy stock for them? Not at all. Not to give them anything except time, and that for money; not to give them anything but an extension of time of payment, with 5 per cent interest. There is nothing very wicked about it. Why, this morning I received a check from a man to pay last year's interest upon a mortgage on property which I sold to him 10 or 13 years ago, the mortgage being due probably 10 years ago. I am glad to extend the time personally from year to year, although the interest has never been kept up to date, and there never has been the maximum interest charged as allowed by the contract or by law.

Why should the Government of the United States, seeking to help these people and people its territory, be meaner than the individual would be? I claim no special grace for my leniency; it is common practice. It is what everybody knows. Give these people endeavoring to settle the dry West under adverse conditions—and most of them will fail probably at the best—give them every opportunity at least which the Government can afford. [Applause.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] on behalf of the West in general, and especially on behalf of the struggling homesteaders throughout the Western States, for his magnificent, eloquent, splendid, and just appeal for the settlers on the public domain. I want to say further that if this House during the past 10 or 15 years had exhibited the same spirit of generosity, humanity, patriotism, fair dealing, and ordinary common sense and common justice toward the western people that is indicated by the remarks just delivered by the gentleman from Illinois we would have twice as many inhabitants in the Western States as we have to-day. It has been because of this harsh and utterly unwarranted policy shown here to-day; this critical and microscopic examination, picayunish interference, and narrow-minded, begrudging statesmanship toward the development of our country; this constant harrassing of everybody who tries to get a home upon the public domain or who tries to open up or improve any of the resources on the public domain; it is very largely because of that policy, so-called conservation, that hostile manner of treatment by Congress and the Interior Department and the Agricultural Department, that the West has not been settled up the way it ought to have been and is not now being developed as it should. When a man goes on the public domain to-day to make a home on the character of land that is now left open to

settlement he has got to wear out his life on that piece of ground to make a home that will support himself and family.

It is a fight of a generation, with nearly everything against him. He has to heroically brave and endure a thousand hardships, privations, and heartbreaking disappointments that none of you gentlemen from the older States can ever realize or appreciate, and what inducement is there for a new settler to go out when he reads the records of Congress, reads the proceedings of our unanimous-consent days in this House for the past 10 years, and sees the nagging, picayunish criticism and aggravating obstruction of everything that is absolutely and imperatively necessary for the development of that country? What is the sense or reason or excuse for this attitude? Why should the West be penalized this way? Who can blame people for being skeptical and hesitating about going out there to try to make a home and endeavor to develop that country and people up the great West, when a large per cent of Congress, who know nothing whatever about the public-land legislation or the conditions that obtain out there, are constantly obstructing and preventing every just appeal they make? I have sat here every hour constantly on every unanimous-consent Monday after Monday for nearly 11 years trying, with the other western Members, to obtain imperative legislation for our country, measures so plain and self-evidently just that no one, it would seem, could have the heart to object to them, matters in which there was no politics and for which all the western Members have been united for the development of that country. And yet this is a fair example to-day. We have now sat here and spent an hour and a half haggling and heckling on a little bill that ought to be passed in two minutes. I have no personal concern about this particular bill. I am complaining about this time-killing, harassing, obstructive attitude of some Members of the House toward western measures. I say, What encouragement is there for anybody to try to develop our western country out there? With Members of the House in this frame of mind, what inducement is there for a man to spend all of his life on a piece of worthless land trying to help Uncle Sam and at the same time to get a home in response to the noblest instinct of the human race, that of trying to build a home for himself and his family? If there ever was a class of people on earth that deserve the good will and kind consideration of Congress, it is the public-land settlers of the arid West. And yet they always get this petty, narrow, harping, carping, picayunish, harassing, technical disputes and dissection, and drastic and impractical restrictions of all these western bills whenever we try to help the people out in that country to get a home or do anything toward developing that country. It does seem to me, if there is any one sentiment or habit in Congress that ought to be condemned, it is this most unjust and unkind spirit of distrust and incredulity and cruel infliction of untold and useless hardships upon these poor people simply because they can not help themselves. We of the West have got only about 8 per cent of the membership on the floor of this House. If we only had the membership in numbers to compel fair treatment, we would not have all this nagging that we are compelled to endure in order to get through a few little bills on the Unanimous Consent Calendar. Under the rules of the House, practically speaking, the only way we ever can get our bills considered is on this calendar. Every one of these bills on this calendar ought to be passed, and passed within an hour, and without objections, unless some one who knows about the conditions knows some reason for objecting to or amending them. No western Member ever sets himself up as the special guardian of the whole country or of any portion of it that he knows nothing about.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. I regret very much that the gentleman from Colorado has assumed to scold the Members of the House because of the interest they take in the bills on the Unanimous Consent Calendar. When one looks at the Calendar for Unanimous Consent as it appears to-day we find that practically nine-tenths of the bills thereon come from the Committee on the Public Lands. Now, I think Members of the Congress and Members of the House of Representatives are disposed to be very fair, but we know, those of us who examine the Calendar for Unanimous Consent, that practically the whole Calendar is an assemblage of bills reported from the Committee on the Public Lands. Now, if those of us who are not members of the Committee on the Public Lands, those who come from States where public lands are no longer available, if we are to sit here and take everything which the Committee on the Public Lands prescribes, then we are due to swallow some awful doses, and I think it is entirely to the credit of the membership of this House and those Members who do not come from these public-land States to take an interest in these things, because the Calendar for Unanimous Consent is

properly a calendar for the consideration of bills to which there is little or no opposition and where no new principles of legislation are laid down, and I am sure that the Committee on the Public Lands has as much consideration in this House, if not more consideration, than any committee that comes before it. What I immediately rose for was to say that it seems to me that the legal aspect of this amendment which is proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts eliminates a very necessary feature of this bill. I think this is an emergency bill, and an emergency does not mean that every time a particular condition exists that the law must be renewed, therefore the emergency applies to this particular bill. This is territory in the Fort Peck Indian Reservation which is intended to be covered by legislation so that an emergency might be met. Now, what is the emergency? As the gentleman from Illinois said, this bill has been pending here for two years or more. It may be that an emergency will exist next year. It does exist this year because of the failure of crop conditions. It may be so unfortunate that the emergency may exist next year, but it is necessary that this second proviso extending payment for a period of one year thereafter should be contained therein; otherwise we are met with the necessity of bringing this bill back again in practically the same form in six months, or less than six months, for the purpose of Congress meeting the emergency.

Now, this bill applies, I am told, to about 200 people out there who are struggling along with this development of Indian land. I believe they should be encouraged. I think the language contained in the second proviso is absolutely necessary if this is to be regarded as emergency legislation. To strike it out would simply offer to take care of one branch of the dilemma and not take care of another situation which is equally bad, and would result immediately, or within a short time at least, in another bill being brought in here to take care of practically the same situation. This bill takes care of an emergency in a limited territory for a particular purpose. It is not laying down a general proposition. It is ready to protect this one emergency, these few people who are there endeavoring to make homesteads for themselves. And I trust the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] will not be adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TILSON). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That moneys paid as interest provided for herein shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the Fort Peck Indians, the same as moneys realized from the sale of the lands.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

It is pleasing to know that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] has joined hands with the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] in furthering the passage of this so-called emergency legislation. I suppose some Members who seek to keep informed on the passage of legislation in the House ought to feel utterly crushed at the legislative scolding of the gentleman from Colorado. But, Mr. Speaker, the attitude of these same western Members, comprising about 8 per cent of the membership of the House, in seeking to further legislation for the benefit of and protection of these poor homesteaders who make up a respectable portion of the population of these States, is not such as to warrant Members in giving the Committee on the Public Lands free scope in reporting legislation. They come in here with measures which upon their face say that these homesteaders are charity patients of Uncle Sam, and Uncle Sam must put his hands into the Treasury and help them out upon all occasions when they seek to appeal to him for aid. Now, the Congress has been favorably disposed toward these homesteaders, and the men who have gone in to develop mines and mineral lands, and so forth, particularly during the war emergency. But we find it does not make any difference whether the department which is appointed for the purpose of supervising public-land affairs, or Indian affairs, or forest-reservation affairs, and various other matters relating to the interests of the Government, recommend these measures or not, we find that these western Members are sufficiently influential upon committees to have reports brought in here favoring projects which the department, in many instances, are very bitterly opposed to.

I want to assure the gentleman from Colorado, as far as I am personally concerned, that I have never attempted to indulge in any nagging or any picayunish criticism or any petty politics upon any of these measures, and he knows well that I have voted for a great many of them. But I do believe that it is within the province of any single Member of this House, whether

he comes from a public-land State or the more thickly settled portion of the country, to ask questions about any bill, particularly when it is sought to put it through here by unanimous consent, and that he is entitled to a reply if people are able to give the information, and that unless somebody indulges in obstructive tactics it comes with rather poor grace from the gentleman from Colorado, who is an expert upon these matters and who knows these things right off the bat, to indulge in scolding rather than seeking to give information.

Many of us would like to know what these measures mean or what the effect of them is going to be, and I think we are entitled to an answer. But I have not seen upon this measure any nagging or microscopic, picaresque criticism, or anything of that sort. I offered an amendment, which I think ought to be adopted, and I think without that amendment having been adopted we pass legislation general in scope as applied to this particular reservation, and giving them a preference that is not given to the other reservations under similar conditions.

Now, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] has called attention to the fact that the Committee on Public Lands has several measures upon the calendar. It always has, and it necessarily must have. But I think the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] will seek to impart information when gentlemen arise to offer amendments or ask questions which they try to make intelligent—and sometimes it is difficult to make questions intelligent to some gentlemen here—that they are entitled to a respectful answer, and not have a statement made as a statement of fact here on the floor, glorifying the poor homesteader—and he is entitled to all the glory he can get—but condemning the man who is seeking to get information in order that he may vote intelligently.

There have been measures that have gone through the House by unanimous consent, relating not only to public-land matters but to other matters, that Members have lived to regret that they did not ask a few questions about before they permitted action upon them. So I trust the gentleman from Colorado will find when this splendid measure has become a law that it is possible to meet the problems arising from the Unanimous Consent Calendar, notwithstanding the glorious defense of the gentleman from Illinois, in a little smoother spirit and with a little more tolerance for Members who seek information before bills are enacted that are of great importance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read a third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, just one moment.

I did not object to the taking up of this bill. I do not make a practice ordinarily of objecting to the consideration of bills by unanimous consent, but I do hope that the Committee on Public Lands does not contemplate the extension of the policy laid down in this bill. It is revolutionary. Yet it really amounts to the establishment of a leasing system covering Indian lands, a system under which, if the Secretary of the Interior is complacent—and in a majority of cases he will be, because he will be so constantly urged in the matter—a settler buying Indian lands may retain those lands indefinitely without paying for them upon the payment of 5 per cent per annum on a purchase price of a few dollars per acre. It establishes a system under which lands may be so held indefinitely and pay no taxes. I can think of nothing more pernicious than the policy which this bill inaugurates, and I hope it will be limited to the Fort Peck Agency, although I shall expect—

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Colorado is generally sound in his views on public lands, and I am surprised that he favors this legislation. I shall expect that there will follow this legislation in the course of time a bill authorizing the issuance of patents without full payment, and following that, some further legislation relieving ultimately from any payment. It is a dangerous road we have entered upon under this legislation, whether we shall go further in the direction I have suggested or shall continue under the policy laid down in the bill.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I will say to the gentleman from Wyoming that I do not think there is any ground for his fear

about the Committee on the Public Lands bringing in any policy that would tend to anything in the nature of a leasing policy, or anything of that kind. But does not the gentleman know just as well as I do that it is the ambition and the earnest hope of every man in the West to obtain a patent just as soon as he can?

Mr. MONDELL. I think that is generally the case with the right kind of settlers.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Is it not generally so?

Mr. MONDELL. Every man who so desires will question this legislation, which would authorize his neighbor, after he had paid the sums due and received his patent and began to pay taxes—would authorize his neighbor to escape the payment of taxes indefinitely by appealing to the Secretary and by paying the small sum of 5 per cent of the balance due on his land. This is the first legislation I can recall in which we have contemplated a system under which public lands, Indian or otherwise, can be held indefinitely without patenting, and therefore without the payment of taxes, the only requirement being that the settler shall pay annually 5 per cent on a nominal purchase price.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HICKS. My point of order is that we are discussing the bill when the time has come to vote on the bill. The gentleman did not ask unanimous consent, and therefore he is out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman had already yielded the floor. The previous question had not been ordered; and if there is anything before the House, the gentleman has the right to discuss it. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A division is asked for.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 40, noes 1.

So the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. RIDDICK, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

PUBLIC LAND FOR NATIONAL SANITARIUMS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 1125) to authorize the Secretary having jurisdiction of the same to set aside certain public lands to be used as national sanitariums by fraternal or benevolent organizations, and for other purposes.

The title of the bill was read.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to call to the attention of the House one or two things in connection with this bill, even at the risk of falling within the large number of disreputable classifications which the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] has enumerated. In connection with that I want to suggest this to the House, that I believe it is desirable not that fewer Members of the House from the East should give some attention to these public-land bills, but that more of us should do so. There are a few gentlemen in the House from the public-land States who know exactly what they want. They represent constituencies that make very serious demands upon them, and at times it becomes very embarrassing to those gentlemen to restrain the omnivorous desires of their constituents in trying to annex all of the public land that is possible.

Now, in that situation it is very desirable that some of us who do not have to face that sentiment from home should be on guard, to take part in the deliberations upon these bills which affect not only the interests of the public-land States but the interests of the United States as well.

Now, the difficulty that we face in connection with that, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] has suggested, is that we Members from the Eastern States are novices in these matters, while gentlemen like the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] are experts. As for myself, I have tried to learn something of these matters, but my effort has been almost a total failure, and I had come to the point where I had desired to put my faith in the judgment of those experts employed by the Federal Government in the Department of the Interior, depending upon them to safeguard the public interests and desiring to cooperate with them. Since the gentleman from Colorado has brought up this subject I want to suggest, however, that I have now reached the point where I do not feel that I can blindly follow the advice of the appointed officers of the Government in these matters. I can not follow the advice

of the Interior Department, because it has become apparent that the Interior Department can neither draft legislation in proper language, so that it can intelligently present a program, nor can we depend upon them always to give us the information in the possession of the Government that we are entitled to.

I will not now discuss, as I shall discuss at some other time, a bill upon this calendar where the ground is taken from under suits brought in a court of the United States at the request of the Department of the Interior, where parties in direct fraud have secured or tried to secure title to the public land, and that iniquity having come to the attention of the Department of the Interior, that department very accommodately has O. K.'d legislation now pending before this House that will put an end to those suits and vest this land probably in the hands of these fraudulent claimants.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RUCKER. What question is pending?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Is there objection to the consideration of this bill?

Mr. RUCKER. The question was not submitted by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the regular order demanded?

Mr. RUCKER. I want the regular order.

Mr. CRAMTON. The regular order is, Is there objection to this bill? I will object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is made.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill just objected to may remain on the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the bill remain and go to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. CRAMTON. Reserving the right to object, I feel that sufficient time ought to elapse so that when the bill comes up again the House may be in a mood to give it consideration, and therefore I object.

Mr. RAKER. It would not come up to-day.

Mr. CRAMTON. I understand that.

LANDS FOR SCHOOLHOUSE SITE AND GROUNDS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 1124) to authorize entering of the public lands by school districts for schoolhouse site and ground.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to call the attention of the gentleman from California who wrote the report on this bill to the fact that on page 5 it indicates that the bill has the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture. I notice on reading the letter of the Secretary that he distinctly objects to the inclusion of the national forests under the bill. If the gentleman from California insists on carrying out his program, I shall have to object.

Mr. CRAMTON. And with the permission of the gentleman I wish to call attention to the fact that it expressly provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall have the right to fix the rules and regulations as to the disposition of lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is true.

Mr. CRAMTON. And furthermore the selection of the land to be given to the school districts is entirely in the hands of the school district and the Interior Department can have no discretion.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, may I read the language referred to by the gentleman from Minnesota on page 5 of the report made by the gentleman from California?

The committee after full consideration is of the same opinion as the Secretary of Agriculture, that lands within national forests should not be eliminated from the provisions of the bill, and that there should be no possible objections to the building of schoolhouses with the necessary playground, recreation park, etc., in connection therewith in a forest reserve.

Mr. RAKER. That is a misprint.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. When did the gentleman discover that it was a misprint?

Mr. RAKER. Just now.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman ought to read the printed report. It is easy to say that it is a misprint, but it was not a misprint of the Printing Office.

Mr. RAKER. It is a typographical error.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It is clearly a statement that is not true.

Mr. ANDERSON. In the preceding paragraph it says—

The suggestion of the Secretary of the Interior that the bill, if enacted, be made applicable only to unreserved public lands was adopted by the committee and included in amendment No. 2.

That is not true.

Mr. RAKER. The committee took up each amendment separately—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That statement in the report is not true and is not borne out by the facts.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman read the quotation from the report again? I did not catch it.

Mr. ANDERSON (reading)—

The suggestion of the Secretary of the Interior of having the time limit in which the school district shall construct suitable and a permanent school building thereon, and construct and maintain permanent wagon and automobile roads, is provided for in amendment No. 3.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I have a notation opposite that "not true." Does the gentleman say that is a typographical error?

Mr. RAKER. The suggestion was made and an amendment was offered by the chairman of the committee. The committee believed that that covers the amendments offered by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior. That is the view the committee took of it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The committee evidently never looked at the bill. No sensible man could read and examine the bill and believe anything of the kind. You might as well say you believe black is white when it is right before you.

Mr. RAKER. The amendment was suggested and offered by the chairman of the committee and it was believed that it covered both points made by the Secretary of the department, so that there could be no question about it. You will find it on lines 7 and 8 of the bill.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. What is the use?

Mr. RAKER. That was the intention.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I do not know what the intention was, but the intention of the report was to make people who read it believe that the committee had adopted the recommendations of the Secretary of Agriculture—

Mr. RAKER. Not at all. The report says:

The Committee on the Public Lands fully considered the reports of the two Secretaries. The suggestion of the Secretary of the Interior that the bill, if enacted, be made applicable only to unreserved public lands was adopted by the committee and included in amendment No. 2.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That is directly the reverse of the fact. The committee directly adopted the reservation to make this bill applicable to forest reserves.

Mr. RAKER. That is not the question. The question is not with reference to forest reserves, and the Secretary did not refer to them.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The Secretary of the Interior expressly referred to the question of forest reserves and suggested that they be left out of the bill.

Mr. RAKER. The Secretary refers to the reserved land. Public reserved lands and forest reserves are different.

The committee adopted the amendment of the Agricultural Department eliminating reserved lands, including in the bill forest reserves, and the committee report is identically as it is stated and as the committee intended and as by a special vote in the committee it was placed in the bill.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I do not know how obtuse the committee may be, but here is the language of the Secretary of the Interior in the report upon this bill. The Secretary says:

The Secretary of Agriculture, under date of April 12, 1917, has reported that no legislation along this line is needed for national forest reserve lands, the situation being taken care of by existing laws applicable to such reservations. I therefore suggest that the bill for enactment be made applicable only to unreserved public land.

Now, the meaning of that right on the face was that national forest reserve land should not be included, and thereupon the committee says it agreed to the recommendation and expressly inserts an amendment to include forest lands, directly the reverse of the fact.

Mr. RAKER. No; the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I frequently have been mistaken, but I do not believe I am now.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Anybody can demand the regular order.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman will yield for that purpose.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Nobody has the floor except by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. The parliamentary inquiry was, What is the status now? I understood that the bill was objected to. I hope, however, that objection was not made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman was under misapprehension. The question now is whether the bill shall be considered or not.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARD. My impression was that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] objected to the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The proceeding is by unanimous consent under the reservation of the right to object.

Mr. RAKER. So that the House may fully understand, I just want a few moments in which to say this: This bill came before the committee, and a report of the Secretary of the Interior and a report of the Secretary of Agriculture were before the committee. The committee took up serially the suggested amendments by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture. They adopted a couple of the amendments suggested by the Secretary of the Interior and possibly one by the Secretary of Agriculture, but the rest were not adopted. They ordered a report made. Upon the amendment in regard to which the suggestion was made, as read by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], in regard to the statement that the report of the committee and the report of the department are not in accordance I desire to say with due deference that the facts are that upon this first amendment the question was whether or not it included reserved public lands. There are public lands, reserved lands, and forest lands. Now, to eliminate and avoid that question the committee used the language that was adopted, as suggested by the chairman of the committee, upon an amendment which covered the Secretary's report and which reads as follows, so there can be no question. I read from page 1 of the bill, lines 7 and 8:

One-sixteenth quarter section of public lands not reserved for public use, other than a forest reserve.

They struck that out, and after the word "public" they inserted as follows:

Lands, or lands within a forest reserve, not otherwise reserved for public use.

In other words it allowed an entry upon public lands otherwise not reserved for public use, and second, in the forest reserves, and the three kinds of lands have been maintained before the committee and by the lawyers of the committee and by the Supreme Court. There is no question as to the committee's intention, and the language is clear that it permitted the filing only upon public lands that are not otherwise reserved, and second, upon lands in the forest reserves. The committee, I think unanimously—I will not say as to the number—voted down the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture that it do not include forest reserves, because they believe from the presentation of the matter, from the report of the Secretary of Agriculture himself, and the fact that there could be no objection to authorizing a sufficient amount of lands for school grounds and a park in connection therewith that it might go to the Government and title issue, to the end that school districts might build large schoolhouses, and the title might be in them and might not be at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture to revoke it at his discretion. Now, that is what the facts are. It is now presented to the House for its action, and there is no intention to the contrary. It covers the question clearly, and I trust the House will permit the legislation to come before it for its consideration, and if the House by its vote determines that the forest land shall not be included, why we will have to abide by its judgment.

Let me call the attention of the House to this, that there can not be any higher use of the land within the Government forest reserves in the West or elsewhere than to allow 10 acres of that land to be selected by a school district, fenced in for a playground, and get substantial schoolhouses and outbuildings, to the end that the community will develop and that the rising generation will have an opportunity to have all the beauties of nature surround them instead of being hampered and tied. There can be no question about it. Another question is the Secretary says that he has granted many permits for school purposes, but they are only temporary and they are subject to his revocation. Now, if that is the fact, it is a fact there can not be any objection to permitting this department to select, or rather the party to select, and then the department determine whether or not it shall be approved after it has been selected. It is in line with development, with progress—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Oh, well, that is old. Get down to bedrock.

Mr. RAKER. I am.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, here is a bill that was introduced in the first place to give school districts authority to purchase school sites in public lands, and there may have been some question under the language of the bill as introduced whether it was applicable to lands in forest reserves. The bill was referred to the Secretary of the Interior, who made a report

upon it. The bill was also referred to the Secretary of Agriculture, who made a report upon it. The Secretary of the Interior reported that the Secretary of Agriculture objected to having the bill include forest lands, and therefore suggested it be made to mean to include only unreserved public lands. The Secretary of Agriculture objected to having the forest reserve lands included in that bill, because it was not essential or necessary, he having authority now. Thereupon we find a report from the Committee on Public Lands stating in one place that the suggestion of the Secretary of the Interior that the bill, if enacted, be applicable only to unreserved public lands was adopted by the committee and included in amendment No. 2, and in another place the statement that the committee, after full consideration, is of the same opinion as the Secretary of Agriculture, that lands within national forests should not be eliminated from the provisions of the bill. Now, the gentleman suggests that that is a typographical error. That is nonsense. It is not possible for that to be a typographical error.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It is not possible for it to be a typographical error.

Mr. RAKER. Now, I want to say in regard to my statement of a moment ago that it was a typographical error that I was mistaken. It is not. It is identically as the committee agreed upon it and read it, and the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] in criticizing the report is not a fact as the report reads.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I have read the report word for word absolutely as it reads. I read the report as it reads, that both the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture reported in favor of leaving out forest reserves.

Mr. RAKER. That is not what the report says. There is not a word of that, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I will read the statement again. The Secretary of the Interior, on page 3 of the report, under date of June 16, 1917, in the second paragraph of the report, says:

The Secretary of Agriculture, under date of April 12, 1917, has reported that no legislation along this line is needed for national forest lands, the situation being taken care of by existing laws applicable to such reservations. I therefore suggest that the bill, if enacted, be made applicable only to unreserved public lands.

Now, if that is not a statement that the Secretary of Agriculture wanted forest lands left out of this bill, and that the Secretary of the Interior suggested that they be left out of the bill, I can not tell A from B. That is what he says.

Mr. RAKER. Just a moment.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That is not all. The Secretary of Agriculture makes the same recommendation in a letter. Thereupon the committee adopts an amendment specifically naming forest reserves to be included in the bill, there being some doubt whether they were included or excluded by the language of the bill before, I suppose, and then report that they have agreed to the recommendation, when the amendment is directly the reverse of the recommendation. It is a fraud upon the House.

Mr. RAKER. So that the House may fully understand it, and I will take but a moment, I will say that on page 5 of this report—and I want to call your attention particularly to it, because I am sure I am right—the Committee on the Public Lands fully considered the reports of the two Secretaries. Now, there is a period. Then we took up the report of the Secretary of the Interior and disposed of it. We then took up the report of the Secretary of Agriculture and disposed of it as follows:

The committee after full consideration is of the same opinion as the Secretary of Agriculture, that lands within national forests should not be eliminated from the provisions of the bill.

It says that the judgment of the committee is that it should not be eliminated, not what the Secretary stated. It is in his report. It is clear, distinct, and positive that the committee recommends, as to the Secretary of Agriculture's report, that they—forest-reserve lands—should not be eliminated from the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Why does the committee say, then, that they are of the same opinion, and use the language "of the same opinion as the Secretary of Agriculture"?

Mr. RAKER. They do not say that.

Mr. ANDERSON. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I have not read this report, but it is a fact that the Agricultural Department did report that it was not in favor of the provision of this bill granting title to land for schoolhouses on the forest reserves. And we discussed it in the committee, and the majority of the committee was in favor of that provision. We thought schoolhouse grounds ought not to be limited to a mere permit, because sometimes it costs a lot of money to build a schoolhouse, and a majority of the committee, as I recall it now, was in favor of reporting the bill to the House disregarding that pro-

vision of the Secretary of Agriculture's report, because we did believe there could be no higher use of a 10-acre piece of land than to put a schoolhouse on it. If the House is in favor of supporting the Agricultural Department by cutting that provision out, all well and good, but that is the fact about that recommendation. Now, we believe they ought to allow a schoolhouse on the forest reserve or on any other kind of public land and give a title to it to the school district. If the House does not think so, but wants to restrict the schoolhouses to private land or land outside of the forest reserve, all well and good. That is all there is about this business.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Certainly.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Does not the General Government make a grant to all of the States that would be affected by this of two sections in every township for school purposes?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; but, my dear sir—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Is not that a fact?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; but that does not apply to mountainous districts.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. If they did get the land they would pay them for it.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. In one way of looking at it, that is true.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Now, then, having given them two sections in every township, and they having wasted that, they want us to give them more land for schoolhouses in places where they might be very dangerous.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Let me answer that. In the mountainous portions of the West—and all forest reserves are in the mountainous portion of the West—these townships do not get sections 16 and 36. We select large compact bodies of public land in lieu of those sections, and consequently there are no school sections or school lands or sites in those mountainous portions of the Western States available for schoolhouses.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. And you have very little use for school lands in forest reserves.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I do not suppose there would be a dozen schoolhouse sites taken in all the United States in these forest reserves. But in forest reserves, where the boundaries are zigzag or very irregular in shape, sometimes a schoolhouse in a forest reserve would be handy to the settlers living adjoining and on both sides.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. As I understand, the committee was not of the same opinion as the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No; not as to whether the Secretary might grant a permit or the Government grant a title to the land. The Secretary of Agriculture has already granted several permits of this kind for sites for schoolhouses, I understand. People have undoubtedly been compelled to build on a forest reserve because there was no other place and they could only get a permit.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. But the committee and the Secretary of Agriculture are not of the same opinion?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Not on this point.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I mean on this point.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No. The committee thought that inasmuch as the Secretary several times had given a permit for schoolhouses that showed that there were places where a schoolhouse could be advantageously located in a forest reserve, and if that was so the Government ought not to confine them to a mere permit but ought to give title to the ground. We did not want to compel a school district to build schoolhouses on temporary permits that might be revoked at any time. That was the thought of the committee. If the House wants us to compel the people to build schoolhouses on temporary permits, or if you do not want us to have a schoolhouse on any forest reserve, then strike it out and let us go on with the rest of the bill. That is not a very important or vital part of the bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Did the committee give consideration to the question of whether the Interior Department ought to have some discretion as to the particular location of the site which they would grant?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The Interior Department is the department that always grants the title to the public land. The Agricultural Department does not grant title to public land. That department only gives permits to run during their good will.

Mr. CRAMTON. Leaving the Department of Agriculture out of it, considering only the granting of sites on the public lands, did the committee give consideration to the question as to whether the department should retain any discretion as to the particular site where the location should be made?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. The bill provides that school districts shall have the "right" to purchase so-and-so.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; but does not the bill provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate or exercise his discretion?

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not find anything that leaves any discretion to the Secretary as to the site, where it is to be located. If a school district picks out a certain piece of land and asks for it, regardless of conditions—

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I have no objection to the Secretary of the Interior being discretionary authority to grant or refuse a site in the sparsely settled portions of the West, but we want to encourage the building of schoolhouses. Are you not in favor of doing that?

Mr. CRAMTON. I want to say to the gentleman that the House is entitled to information. The bill not only must have a good purpose, but it must have such language in it as will subserve that purpose. The bill should be put in proper shape. The gentleman should not be sensitive as to the terminology suggested.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I am not a particle sensitive as to terminology. On the contrary, I am saying that if the bill is not correct, let us amend it. Let us not kill a good bill because one provision in it is objectionable to somebody. I had a little bill here myself once, to try to get 5 acres of public land set aside for a schoolhouse, and I had to worry around here for a long time, and the people got tired of waiting and went and bought some private land and built on it, as I recollect. Here is a general bill providing for schools on the public land. A bill of this kind ought to have passed 50 years ago.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. If the gentleman had that experience, it seems to me it would be wise to pass a bill, without any objection, to let the Secretary of the Interior issue title for schoolhouse sites on the public lands, and not endeavor to steal a march on the forest reserves and locate school buildings nobody knows where in a timbered country and nobody knows for what purpose. Why not take the easy road instead of climbing up a rocky mountain?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. They are not going to locate a schoolhouse on the top of a mountain where nobody could go to it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Well, I do not know about that.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. They do not spend money for nothing.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I do not know about that.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. They might without any justification be accused of various things, but no one would ever charge them with throwing their money away in that manner.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Well, they will beg somebody for the money. [Laughter.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No one should blame people for trying to build schoolhouses wherever there are any children, and fortunately there are children everywhere where there are any people all through the mountains. There can be no objection to authorizing the Secretary to grant a title to a small piece of public land for a schoolhouse. But the only question was as to whether or not we should have a school site of 10 acres of worthless ground on the forest reserve, and we decided that we should. We resolved the doubt in favor of the school, where anybody wants to build one, and we were in favor of giving the school district the land to build on and not make them take a license and occupy the land only during good behavior. There will be very few schoolhouses built on that kind of a foundation.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The regular order is, Is there objection?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain on the calendar, at the foot.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I object. I think this bill ought to go back to the committee and have a proper report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next one.

LIBRARY INFORMATION SERVICE, BUREAU OF EDUCATION.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 6870) to provide for a library information service in the Bureau of Education.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. BLANTON. I reserve the right to object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, I doubt very seriously whether this bill ought to be taken up and considered and passed by the 30 or 40 Members that we now have present and which we usually have present under such circumstances. This is an important measure, to my mind. This bill is based almost entirely upon a suggestion made by Miss Edith Guerrier, of the Boston Public Library. I doubt very seriously whether her suggestion is good and should be acted upon. At least it should be thoroughly considered by the House. This bill is going right against the policy suggested by the distinguished floor leader on the other side [Mr. MONDELL], as indicated in the public press, that we were going to begin the process of retrenchment. This measure provides a director at \$4,000 a year, and an assistant at \$3,000, and a chief clerk at \$2,000, and a stenographer at \$1,600, and such other employees, not exceeding \$8,100 per annum, as the director may want. To my mind the possible good that may be accomplished by this legislation hardly justifies this expenditure and the creation of such new offices.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, is it the gentleman's purpose to object to the consideration of this bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I was suggesting the propriety—

Mr. BANKHEAD. I demand the regular order.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman demands the regular order, which stops all discussion, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas objects. The Clerk will report the next one.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE SUSQUEHANNA RIVER AT LACEYVILLE, PA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 8992) for the construction of a bridge across the Susquehanna River at Laceyville, Wyoming County, Pa.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania a bridge, with approaches thereto, across the Susquehanna River at Laceyville, Wyoming County, Pa., at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The question was taken; and there were 33 ayes and noes.

So the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

OCHOCO NATIONAL FOREST, OREG.

The next bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 348) to add certain land to the Ochoco National Forest, Oreg.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, I ask that those who have charge of the bill or made the report advise us as to the necessity for the inclusion of this land in the Ochoco National Forest of Oregon.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, one of the main reasons is that the land in question has upon it some springs which command a grazing area of some 6,000 acres in this Ochoco National Forest. A further reason is that about 1,200 acres of the land is practically a part of the forest reserve now, for the reason that that area is embraced in a stock-driveway withdrawal for the purpose of giving stock a passageway into the forest reserves. If this land is added to the forest reserves, drift fences will be placed on the land, which will prevent stock grazing on the forest reserves from escaping and preventing other loose stock from encroaching on the forest reserves.

Mr. GARD. What is meant by the expression in line 5, page 1, of this bill, "subject to all prior valid adverse rights"? What adverse rights to the incorporation of a national forest reserve are there?

Mr. SINNOTT. Adverse rights would be a homestead application heretofore allowed by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. GARD. What adverse rights are there involved here?

Mr. SINNOTT. As a matter of fact, there are none, as I understand. The Secretary of the Interior refers to applications which are suspended, and of course no rights accrue by virtue of a suspended application.

Mr. GARD. The report of the Secretary of the Interior says that some 1,581 acres are enterable under the 320-acre enlarged-homestead law and 480 acres are embraced in the suspended homestead applications, and so forth. These lands have not as yet been classified under said act. Would these reservations be included in prior adverse rights?

Mr. SINNOTT. If any applications had not been allowed by the Secretary of the Interior, it would not be a prior adverse right. If they had been allowed, they would be a prior adverse right.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. What is the character of the lands—are they susceptible to cultivation?

Mr. SINNOTT. The report of the Department of Agriculture states that only about 12 acres of this land is susceptible of cultivation. The rest is wild, broken, and contains some timber which is suitable for forest purposes. The Secretary of Agriculture stated that the main object for taking this land is the springs, to be used in connection with the grazing on the forest reserve.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I understood the gentleman to say that only a small area would be susceptible of cultivation?

Mr. SINNOTT. I think the report states about 10 or 12 acres.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 348) to add certain lands to the Ochoco National Forest, Oreg.

Be it enacted, etc., That the following described lands be, and the same are, included in and made a part of the Ochoco National Forest, Oreg., subject to all prior valid adverse rights, and that said lands shall hereafter be subject to all laws affecting national forests: Sections 27 and 34, township 17 south, range 21 east, sections 3 and 10 and the east half of section 9, township 18 south, range 21 east, all of Willamette meridian and base.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were 31 ayes and noes.

So the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. SINNOTT, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

CLAIMS OF SIOUX TRIBE OF INDIANS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 1018) authorizing the Sioux Tribe of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, the bill authorizes the Sioux Tribe of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims. Is there anyone representing the bill or anyone from the Committee on Indian Affairs to explain the contents of the bill? It seems to be a comprehensive statement of a new procedure, and I would suggest, in the absence of anyone interested in the bill, that it be passed.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. DYER. Would the bill go to the foot of the calendar?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not so understand.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask to modify the request for unanimous consent that the bill be passed without prejudice and go to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. I accept that suggestion.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request as modified?

There was no objection.

RIGHTS OF WAY THROUGH PUBLIC LANDS.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 2946) to amend acts to permit the use of rights of way through the public lands for tramroads, canals, and reservoirs, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman who made the report on this bill what is the necessity for setting aside such a large amount of land for such purposes?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. It only proposes to set aside five acres. These canal attendants use horses in connection with their work, and it is necessary that they have a space of ground in which to feed and exercise them and to erect a house and barn and other outbuildings and upon which to store hay.

Mr. WALSH. Where do they exercise them now, and where do they get their hay stored?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I suppose they get some exercise from riding up and down the canals.

Mr. WALSH. Well, it looks to me too much like an attempt to hitch up some grazing proposition with an irrigation project. I do not understand—

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. There is no irrigation. It is not possible to irrigate any of this land which is desired. It is located on the desert, and the only way to get the water to irrigate five acres would be by pumping from the canal, and that would not be possible without a great deal more expense than would be warranted.

Mr. WALSH. Would it not be possible, if they got five acres adjoining one of these ditches or laterals, for them to swing that ditch around into that land?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. It might be possible, but not practicable.

Mr. WALSH. Then if he can not grow anything on the land, how can the horses graze on it? Of course the gentleman would not contend—

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. The gentleman is the one who said that they wanted to graze the horses; I have not said so.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman said nothing can grow on it, as I understood.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. It will not without water for irrigation purposes.

Mr. WALSH. And it can not be irrigated?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. It can not be irrigated advantageously because of the expense involved in getting the water to it.

Mr. WALSH. And therefore if they can not grow anything there, and it would be so expensive to get water on it, it could not be used very advantageously for grazing for those four or five horses?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. No; not for grazing.

Mr. WALSH. If that is so, why do they need 5 acres?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. For the simple reason they will probably have a half dozen horses which they use in going up and down the canals, and 5 acres would not be too much on which to exercise five or six horses and give space in which to roam about.

Mr. WALSH. This also permits the erection of dwellings and other buildings. Where are those buildings located now?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. The buildings used by the men now are very cheap wooden shacks. The company desires to have this law enacted in order that they may have a permanent site on which to erect comfortable homes costing probably two or three thousand dollars for these ditch riders. Under existing conditions they do not feel warranted in going to such a large expense, and for that reason they desire to have this law enacted.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman know how many of these ditch riders there are who are affected by this legislation?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I suppose there are probably 50 people who will be accommodated on the particular project I have in mind in Idaho.

Mr. WALSH. But this applies to all irrigation projects?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. For all irrigation projects, but the land can not be used for any other purpose than the purpose for which it is intended under the proposed law. The bill passed both the House and Senate in the last Congress, but came back from the Senate with a slight amendment, which has been incor-

porated in the present bill, but it was received too late to receive the Speaker's attention before adjournment.

Mr. WALSH. In view of the gentleman's representations, Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the reservation of the right to object.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I want to direct the attention of the gentleman from Idaho to this language in line 2 of the bill, as to what, in his opinion, is the difference between "permits or easements," and whether there is any advantage in retaining the word "respectively" as asked to be inserted by the Secretary of the Interior on page 2 of the report in which it states that the bill be amended so as to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant "permits or easements, respectively, embracing not to exceed 5 acres," and so forth. Is there any difference in the application that this should be made not to exceed 5 acres in what is called a permit and what is called an easement?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. No; they are practically synonymous terms. A permit is simply an easement, a revocable authority to use the land.

Mr. GARD. A permit may permit the use of the land, the entire use of the land, and an easement, I suspect, may be limited to some access to and from the land.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Well, they are synonymous terms.

Mr. GARD. Not necessarily.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. They are in this instance. The word "permit" really could be eliminated because it adds nothing and usually applies to lands in the forest reserve, while an easement applies to land on the public domain.

Mr. GARD. This is, of course, an application for land in the public domain?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Yes. Although, as the bill is drawn, it applies to the forest reserves, I intend to offer an amendment that was suggested by the Secretary of Agriculture after this report was made.

Mr. GARD. What is the amendment?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I propose to offer an amendment at the end of the bill inserting the words:

Provided, That this act shall not apply to lands within national forests.

This was suggested in a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture after the report was made and was entirely gratuitous, but we have no objection to the limitation of the act to the public domain.

Mr. GARD. Does the gentleman believe that the word "permits," as contained in line 3, should be stricken out?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I do not think it makes any difference whether it is stricken out or left in.

Mr. GARD. I am asking that because I am unfamiliar with the application of the word "permits" or "easements" to these 5 acres of ground that may be granted adjoining rights of way.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I have no objection to eliminating the word "permits." I do not think it makes any difference at all.

Mr. GARD. As suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT], there is a very great distinction in the understanding of the law, as we of the States that are not public-land States do not consider that a permit is an easement.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. They are synonymous terms so far as they affect public lands.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2946) to amend acts to permit the use of the right of way through the public lands for tramroads, canals, and reservoirs, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That in addition to the rights of way granted by sections 18, 19, 20, and 21 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to repeal timber-culture laws, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891 (26 Stats., p. 1095), as amended by the act of Congress entitled "An act to amend the irrigation act of March 3, 1891 (26 Stats., p. 1095, sec. 18), and to amend section 2 of the act of May 11, 1898 (30 Stats., p. 404)," approved March 4, 1917 (39 Stats., p. 1197), and, subject to the conditions and restrictions therein contained, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to grant permits or easements for not to exceed 5 acres of ground adjoining the right of way at each of the locations, to be determined by the Secretary of the

Interior, to be used for the erection thereon of dwellings or other buildings or corrals for the convenience of those engaged in the care and management of the works provided for by said acts.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, page 2, line 3, strike out the words "permits or."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. GARD: Page 2, line 3, strike out the words "permits or."

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Ohio seems to be anxious to follow the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in matters of legislation of this character, I suggest that the Secretary use the term "grants, permits, or easements," and it seems to me that unless there is some good reason for opposing the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior in the matter—

Mr. GARD. I am not following the Secretary of the Interior or anybody else. I am asking a question of the gentleman, who I suspect knows all about these public-land bills. I am sure that he knows more than I do, because he is from a State where he has grown familiar with them. The bill itself is an act to permit the use of the right of way through public lands for tramroads, canals, and reservoirs, and so forth, and it refers all along to rights of way, and an easement in the ordinary acceptance of legal phrases is recognized as a right of way, while a permit may be an absolute grant to use the land, not for access or not for a particular purpose or any purpose at all. The word "permit" is so broad that I suggest, in the interest of the real meaning of the legislation, which is an act to grant the use of the right of way through public lands, it be confined to the right of way, if that is what it means.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. DEWALT. I would suggest to the gentleman from Ohio that an easement is actually a right in property, and is really a hereditament and has a permanency of character which could not be taken from the grantee by the act of the grantor, and could not be taken except by the acts of both being willing to do so after it was granted, whereas a permit is revocable at the option of the party who grants the provision. "Easement" is a much stronger word than "permit," and it may be that it is the idea of the Secretary of the Interior to grant only a limited permit, which may be revoked at any time by the department, whereas if the easement is granted it becomes permanent in its nature; it becomes a hereditament under the law.

Mr. GARD. It was for that that I was asking questions from the gentleman from Idaho, because I wanted to understand as to what the law was to carry. I do not know what the understanding of those who have charge of this legislation is. It does not seem to me to be very material, but if it is I want it amended.

Mr. SINNOTT. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman's first interpretation of the word "permit" and the distinction between a permit and an easement, and it seems to me that the word "permit" should be retained there and not eliminated. I agree with the gentleman's first interpretation. For that reason I prefer to see the amendment withdrawn.

Mr. GARD. Does the gentleman, from his understanding of the language in the bill and the circumstances to which the bill applies, believe that the word "permit" is a word proper to use in connection with this grant? If it is, I have no objection to its being used.

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes; I think so.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, then I withdraw the proposed amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio withdraws the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, on the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture, who has volunteered the suggestion, I offer an amendment at the end of the bill:

Provided, That this act shall not apply to lands within national forests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Idaho offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Idaho moves to amend by inserting at the end of the bill the following proviso: "*Provided*, That this act shall not apply to lands within national forests."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 38, noes 0.

So the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. SMITH of Idaho, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

WATER SUPPLY ON RECLAMATION PROJECTS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 796) for furnishing water supply for miscellaneous purposes in connection with reclamation projects.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go to the foot of the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent that the bill go to the foot of the calendar. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

TRANSFER OF EMPLOYEES IN CLASSIFIED CIVIL SERVICE.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 7404) to repeal section 7 of the act of October 7, 1917, entitled "An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes."

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. SMITH] if the passage of this measure, repealing this section of the deficiency bill, would not materially interfere with the reduction of the number of employees now here in the city of Washington?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. No; I do not think so. I know of no reason why it should.

Mr. WALSH. It certainly would not aid in that direction, would it?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I do not know that it would have any particular effect.

Mr. WALSH. That being so, Mr. Speaker, rather than pass any legislation affecting these vast numbers, running up into many thousands of employees now in Washington, who came here as the result of the war emergency—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there for a question?

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. I am glad to see that the gentleman is so careful about that point, but rather than refrain from passing legislation that will permit them to stay here, would it not be better, I will ask the gentleman from Massachusetts, that we should pass some legislation that would eliminate them from the Government pay roll and send them home? There are about 40,000 of them, and they ought to be sent home.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman from Texas has introduced a bill to that effect, but I notice it has not reached the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

Mr. BLANTON. I will say to the gentleman that I am going to watch the appropriation bills when they come in.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I have no personal interest in this legislation, but it has been recommended by the president of the Civil Service Commission and also by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of War, and I understand that other Cabinet officers believe that the enactment of this legislation would be helpful in the conduct of the public business. It seems to me that unless there is some reason which has not yet been advanced why the legislation should not be enacted, it should be allowed to be taken up for consideration.

Mr. WALSH. This measure will permit the transfer of employees from one department to another department at an increased rate of compensation?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. If paid from lump-sum appropriations; and the gentleman appreciates the fact that there are a large number of departments that are still operating upon lump-sum appropriations, and will continue to operate for some little time under them, probably beyond the end of this fiscal year. Now, this was enacted, it is true, as emergency legislation, but even though the emergency is over, these lump-sum appropriations

are still available. Does the gentleman think we ought to permit, and by passing this legislation even encourage, these transfers in lieu of promotions?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. We should encourage transfers where it is shown that the public service would be benefited.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. WALSH. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects, and the Clerk will report the next bill.

ADDITIONS TO THE CARIBOU NATIONAL FOREST.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 4311) to authorize the addition of certain land to the Caribou National Forest.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of this bill?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, this is another bill authorizing an addition of certain lands to the national forest reserves, seemingly for a very large amount of land. I would be very glad to have some information as to the necessity for the enactment of this law.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the strip of land which it is proposed to add to the Caribou National Forest in Idaho is near the top of a mountain range and lies between two national forests, one in Wyoming and the other in the State of Idaho. The land can not be utilized for agricultural purposes, but is used to some extent for grazing purposes. This legislation is simply following out the policy of the Agricultural Department to place within national forest reserves such public lands as are only valuable for timber or for the conservation of stream supply.

Mr. GARD. Can I interrupt the gentleman a moment?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Yes.

Mr. GARD. I notice in the letter of Mr. Ousley, the Acting Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, that he suggests that the present bill should be amended by adding at the end of line 5, on page 1, the words "or regulation and improvement of the grazing thereon."

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. There is no objection to the amendment; but it is not really necessary, because after the land is once taken into the national forest grazing is regulated by the department.

Mr. ANDERSON. The trouble with that is that the Secretary could not embrace within the forest reserve, under this authorization, lands that might be contiguous and desirable from the standpoint of grazing for regulation, because the language is not broad enough to cover in the reservation grazing land.

Mr. GARD. Does the gentleman think that this language should be added, "or regulation and improvement of the grazing thereon"?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think so.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I will accept the amendment.

Mr. GARD. Is there a proposition to amend the bill in any other way?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. No; except as shown in the bill. The committee amendments are printed in italics.

Mr. GARD. The gentleman has no objection to the amendment I have suggested being adopted?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. No.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any lands within the following-described areas, found by the Secretary of Agriculture to be chiefly valuable for the production of timber or the protection of stream flow, may be included within and made a part of the Caribou National Forest by proclamation of the President, said lands to be thereafter subject to all laws affecting national forests: Sections 26 and 27, township 9 south, range 46 east, Boise meridian; northwest quarter of section 1, all of section 2, east half of section 12, all of sections 13, 23, 24, 25, 26, 35, and 36, township 10 south, range 45 east, Boise meridian; all of sections 6, 7, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35, township 10 south, range 46 east, Boise meridian, unsurveyed; all of sections 1, 2, 11, 12, 13, 14, east half of section 23, all of 24, 25, and 36, township 11 south, range 45 east, Boise meridian; all of unsurveyed township 11 south, range 46 east, Boise meridian; all of section 36, township 12 south, range 45 east, Boise meridian; all of sections 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 29, 30, 31, 32, of township 12 south, range 46 east, Boise meridian, partly unsurveyed; all of sections 5 and 6, and north half of section 7, and north half of section 8, township 13 south, range 46 east, Boise meridian.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "may," insert the words "with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior."

Page 1, line 7, after the word "forest," insert a comma and the word "Idaho" followed by a comma.

Page 2, line 18, change the period, after the word "meridian," to a semicolon and add: "Provided, That all lands embraced in any lawful application or entry pending at the date of the approval of this act be, and the same are hereby, excluded from the provisions of this act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment at the end of line 5, page 1: Add the words "or regulation for improvement in the grazing thereon."

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARD: Page 1, line 5, at the end of the line insert the words "or regulation for improvement of the grazing thereon."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a demand for a division by Mr. BLANTON there were 33 ayes and 1 no.

So the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. SMITH of Idaho, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

READJUSTMENT OF CONTRACT FOR SALE OF OLD POST-OFFICE PROPERTY IN NEW HAVEN, CONN.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 9183) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to adjust the terms of the contract for the sale of the old post-office property in New Haven, Conn.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CONNALLY. Reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman what is the trouble with the contract that it needs adjusting?

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON].

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, as shown in the report accompanying this bill filed by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. ANDREWS], Congress authorized in 1910 the construction of a new Federal building in New Haven. In February, 1917, the new building was so nearly completed that it was believed to be in the interest of the United States to make a contract of sale of the old property. At that time it appeared that the new building would be ready for occupancy within a year. In fact, it was thought that there would be no difficulty in finishing the new building in time to give possession of the old property within a year.

A contract of sale was made by which an advance cash payment was to be made and the balance in yearly installments, with interest on the installments; but bear in mind that delivery of possession was expected to be made within one year.

The war came to us in April, 1917. Soon thereafter, with the consent of the Treasury Department, work was suspended on the new building, so that it was not completed and ready for occupancy until August, 1919. Therefore delivery of possession of the old property could not be made in March, 1918, as it was originally expected by both the purchasers and the Government. Therefore there is a loss of interest on the advance payment for almost a year and a half, besides interest paid by purchasers on deferred installments. It might be stated the other way around, too—the loss of the use of the property by the purchasers for a year and a half. The Secretary of the Treasury very properly proposes to measure that use by the interest, and the purchasers are entirely willing. There seems to be entire agreement between the Secretary of the Treasury and the purchasers as to what will be a fair adjustment of the contract.

Mr. CONNALLY. In other words, the Government will not lose anything except to offset the rent against the interest.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman is correct. It would be done by private parties without any difficulty, but it seems that the Government can not do it without additional legislation. The sole purpose of this bill is to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to make a fair and equitable adjustment of a contract which has become unfair and inequitable by reason of circumstances over which the purchasers, at any rate, had no control.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not make any objection.

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, how much is the amount of interest involved?

Mr. TILSON. As shown in the report, \$25,519.29.

Mr. GARD. That is what is described as the net credit to the purchaser's account?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. GARD. The possession of the building was given to the purchaser on August 12, 1919. When was it proposed to be given under the agreement.

Mr. TILSON. The contract was made February 27, 1917, and it was expected that possession would be delivered on March 21, 1918, as I now recall the dates. The war came on and disarranged matters.

Mr. GARD. Does this readjustment meet with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. TILSON. It does. The gentleman will note in the report that Secretary Glass sends a letter and recommends this as a fair adjustment of the contract.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized, in his discretion and with the consent of the contractors, to modify and readjust the terms of the contract for the sale of the old post-office property in New Haven, Conn., entered into March 13, 1917, in such manner as he may deem equitable and just, if he shall determine that said contract has become inequitable and unjust on account of the unforeseen conditions arising since its execution, with respect to the Government's failure to deliver the property as soon as expected.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read a third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 32, noes 0.

So the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

STANDARD OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 9755) to establish a standard of weights and measures for the following wheat-mill and corn-mill products, namely, flours, hominy, grits, and meals, and all commercial feeding stuffs, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. VESTAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be placed at the foot of the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

AUTHORIZING DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN GRAZING LANDS IN THE STATE OF UTAH.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 3016) to authorize the disposition of certain grazing lands in the State of Utah, and for other purposes.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

CONFERRING CITIZENSHIP UPON INDIANS, ETC.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 288) for the purpose of conferring citizenship upon Indians, segregation of Indian tribal property, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

HOMESTEAD ENTRY OF PUBLIC LANDS FOR MINORS.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 1729) permitting minors of the age of 18 years or over to make homestead entry upon the public lands of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Will the gentleman permit it to go to the foot of the calendar?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

SALARIES OF UNITED STATES MARSHAL AND OTHERS IN LOUISIANA.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 597) providing for an increase of salary for the United States marshal and district attorney for the western district and for the United States district attorney for the eastern district of Louisiana.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the gentleman please reserve his objection?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think not; I am going to object in any event.

Mr. WATKINS. I will be glad of an opportunity to explain the reason why it should be considered.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

ADDITIONS TO OREGON, SIUSLAW, AND CRATER NATIONAL FORESTS, OREG.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 8028) to reserve as parts of the Oregon, Siuslaw, and Crater National Forests in Oregon certain lands that were reverted in the United States pursuant to the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the Oregon & California Railroad Co. against the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the bill seems to be a very comprehensive one. I have not been able to read the report very closely. I would be glad to have those interested explain the bill, if there is necessity for its enactment at this time.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, this bill is practically the same as the one pending during the last Congress. There has been added to it the provision for the protection of the water supply of the city of Ashland. These lands are those that were recovered from the Oregon & California Railroad Co., and they are essential to the protection of the water supply of the several cities named. The four towns named have no source of water supply other than the sources now used by them. If the lands are logged over and the areas burnt thereafter, as they undoubtedly would be sooner or later, and the forest cover destroyed, the waters falling on those mountain ranges will quickly run off and not be absorbed by the soil and by the forest cover, and for a considerable period every summer these towns will be without a sufficient water supply. The land is not transferred out of the possession of the United States. It is transferred from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Agriculture. The Secretary of the Interior sees no objection to the transfer and thinks that the timber, where it will not injure the water supply and its preservation, can be cut and removed under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service, and the Secretary of Agriculture approves that recommendation. The amount transferred in comparison to the total grant is not large; something like 8,400 acres.

Mr. GARD. Is it intended to use this additional forest reserve for the new water supply for Oregon City, Dallas, Corvallis, and Ashland?

Mr. HAWLEY. These four towns have already constructed their pipe lines to the localities where these lands lie. They are part of the areas from which they are now deriving their water supply.

Mr. GARD. What relation do these lands reverted in the United States have to the water supply of those four towns?

Mr. HAWLEY. The towns are already getting their water in part from these lands. The pipe lines run out to other lands just adjoining. If these lands are reserved they will, with others now used by the cities, make an area which will be probably sufficient to provide the necessary water supplies the year around.

Mr. GARD. Is there at this time a failure of the water supply of those cities?

Mr. HAWLEY. The city of Corvallis had to limit its citizens in the domestic use of water for the last two seasons, and they could not be used for irrigation purposes at all during part of the summer seasons.

Mr. GARD. There was a bill before the House, I recall, providing for the relief of Corvallis.

Mr. HAWLEY. This is the same bill, with the addition of the town of Ashland, which was before the last Congress.

Mr. GARD. Was not a bill providing for a water supply for Corvallis passed by the Congress?

Mr. HAWLEY. No; it did not pass. A bill relating to the water supply of McMinnville was passed by the House, but not for the cities named in this bill. There has never been any relief granted to them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none?

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That such portions of the lands hereinafter described as shall be deemed necessary by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture for the conservation and protection of the water supplies of the cities of Oregon City, Dallas, Corvallis, and Ashland, Oreg., and which are within the limits of the grant by the United States to the Oregon & California Railroad Co., that were revested in the United States pursuant to the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the Oregon & California Railroad Co. v. The United States (238 U. S. Stats., p. 393), and an act of Congress approved June 9, 1916, be, and the same are hereby, reserved and set aside as parts of the Oregon, Siuslaw, and Crater National Forests, as follows:

As part of the Oregon National Forest, south and east of the Willamette meridian, Oregon:

Township 5 south, range 4 east, section 1, all; section 11, all; section 13, all; section 15, north half southeast quarter, southwest quarter and north half; section 23, all; section 25, all; township 4 south, range 5 east, section 19, all; section 27, northeast quarter; section 29, northwest quarter northwest quarter; south half northwest quarter; and south half northeast quarter; section 31, all; section 35, east half, for the protection of the water supply of Oregon City, Oreg.

As part of the Siuslaw National Forest, south and west of the Willamette meridian, Oregon:

Township 7 south, range 6 west, section 21, northeast quarter southeast quarter, west half southeast quarter, and southwest quarter; section 29, northeast quarter and south one-half; section 33, north half northeast quarter, northwest quarter and southeast quarter, for the protection of the water supply of Dallas, Oreg.

Township 12 south, range 7 west, section 15, south half southwest quarter, northwest quarter southwest quarter, and southwest quarter southeast quarter; section 21, southeast quarter and north half; section 23, southwest quarter northwest quarter, and west half southwest quarter; section 27, all; section 35, north half, for the protection of the water supply of Corvallis, Oreg.

As part of the Crater National Forest, south and east of the Willamette meridian in Oregon:

Township 39 south, range 1 east, section 19, east one-half; section 21, east one-half of west one-half and east one-half, for the protection of the water supply of Ashland, Oreg.

Sec. 2. That when the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, finds that merchantable timber may be sold from the above-described lands without detriment to the purity or depletion of the water supply, said Forest Service is hereby authorized to sell and dispose of to the highest bidder such merchantable timber on the lands added to said national forests by section 1 hereof in accordance with the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture for the national forests and the entire proceeds of any sale thereof shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States in a special fund designated as "The Oregon and California land-grant fund," referred to in section 10 of the said act of June 9, 1916, and be disposed of in the manner therein designated: *Provided*, That in the event any of said lands are eliminated from said forests as not necessary for the purposes for which this reservation is made they shall be disposed of in the manner provided for by said act of June 9, 1916.

The committee amendments were read; as follows:

Page 2, line 8, after the word "Forests," insert "subject to all laws affecting national forests."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Page 3, line 19, strike out the words "Forest Service, Department" and insert "Secretary."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Page 3, line 21, strike out the word "sold" and insert the word "cut."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Page 3, line 22, strike out the words "Forest Service" and insert the word "Secretary."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Page 3, line 23, strike out the words "sell and."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Page 3, line 24, strike out the words "to the highest bidder."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time; was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 37, noes 3.

So the bill was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to add to the Oregon, Siuslaw, and Crater National Forests in Oregon certain lands that were revested in the United States

pursuant to the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the Oregon & California Railroad Co. v. The United States, and for other purposes."

On motion of Mr. HAWLEY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

FEDERAL OFFICE BUILDING AT ST. LOUIS, MO.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 484) to provide for the erection of a Federal office building on the site acquired for the Subtreasury in St. Louis, Mo.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. GARD. I object.

Mr. DYER. Does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] intend to object finally after any statement is made that may clear up any doubt?

Mr. GARD. The reason I object is that I do not see any submission to the Treasury Department for any recommendation as to the proposed measure.

Mr. DYER. That has been done. Will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, if we are going to waste any time on it, I object.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. I hope the gentleman will reserve his objection. I want to offer an explanation in regard to it.

Mr. BLANTON. Are we not withdrawing the Subtreasuries rather than extending them? I thought the policy of our Government was to draw them in.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. This does draw in. If the gentleman will reserve his objection and let me explain—

Mr. BLANTON. I think there are as many as seven men on the floor who will object, and what is the use of wasting time?

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. I think they will not object when they see that there is no appropriation required, and when we are obliged now to furnish space at \$28,000 a year.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, in order to save time, I object.

ARMY MEDICAL SUPPLIES FOR AMERICAN RED CROSS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was House joint resolution 176, providing for placing certain surplus Army medical supplies at the disposal of the American Red Cross.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I shall have to object.

REPAYMENT OF COMMISSIONS, ETC., UNDER PUBLIC-LAND LAWS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 2129) to amend an act approved March 26, 1908, entitled "An act to provide for the repayment of certain commissions, excess payments, and purchase moneys paid under the public-land laws."

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. SINNOTT. Will the gentleman withhold objection for a moment, so that I can make a very brief explanation?

Mr. GARD. I will.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced at the request of the Secretary of the Interior. The only change it makes in the present law is to require an applicant to file his application within two years for a return of any excess payment or payment on rejection of entry or proof. Sections 1 and 2 of the bill look quite formidable, but they are merely a reenactment of the present law, with the addition of the provisos. Now, section 1, down to line 8, on page 2—down to the proviso on that page—is the present law. And the proviso puts on a statute of limitations requiring the applicant to present his application for a repayment within two years. At the present time he has the right under the first part of section 1 of this bill, which is the present law, to put in his application for a return payment, with no time limit. They are putting in applications in the Interior Department to-day for payments that were made 30 years ago. Attorneys are gleaming over the records of the Interior Department and ascertaining what excess payments were made 30 and 40 years ago, and are presenting applications for repayment and for a refund to the Secretary of the Interior; and all that this bill does is to put a statute of limitations to require applicants within two years to present their applications, and not let them have 50 or 100 years. It seems to me this is a bill that should be enacted into law for the protection of the Treasury. Otherwise, these men can have 50 years to demand these repayments. And bear in mind that the first part of section 1, down to the proviso, and the first part of section 2, down to the proviso, are merely the present law,

and the proviso adds on the statute of limitation, and that is the only difference between the bill and the present law, with the exception of section 4, which authorizes the Secretary to make the rules and regulations. This bill was introduced by the chairman of the Senate committee at the request of the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary of the Interior sent to me a similar request. I introduced the bill, but the Senate bill having been first acted upon, the House committee took up the Senate bill.

Mr. GARD. Would not the bill meet the purpose of the gentleman if he would strike out the proviso and leave this section 4?

Mr. SINNOTT. Oh, no. Then, you would not have any statute of limitations. They would still have eternity in which to present claims.

Mr. GARD. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make rules to carry out the provisions of the act.

Mr. SINNOTT. To carry out the provisions of the act, and the act gives them for all time to present their claims to the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary of the Interior could not enact legislation limiting the period within which they could put in their claims.

Mr. GARD. I would like to know whether the matter before the department might not be so continuous that the limitation of two years would be too narrow a limitation?

Mr. SINNOTT. No; I think that is an ample limitation. It is the same limitation as is placed upon the Government in issuing a patent. The Government has to issue a patent within two years unless there is some adverse proceeding taken. I certainly can see no objection. It is a protection to the Treasury.

Mr. GARD. I withdraw the objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. SINNOTT. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That an act approved March 26, 1908 (35 Stat. L., p. 48), entitled "An act to provide for the repayment of certain commissions, excess payments, and purchase moneys paid under the public land laws," be amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 1. That where purchase moneys and commissions paid under any public land law have been or shall hereafter be covered into the Treasury of the United States under any application to make any filing, location, selection, entry, or proof, such purchase moneys and commissions shall be repaid to the person who made such application, entry, or proof, or to his legal representatives, in all cases where such application, entry, or proof has been or shall hereafter be rejected, and neither such applicant nor his legal representatives shall have been guilty of any fraud or attempted fraud in connection with such application: *Provided*, That such person or his legal representatives shall file a request for the repayment of such purchase moneys and commissions within two years from the rejection of such application, entry, or proof, or within two years from the passage of this act as to such applications, proofs, or entries, as have been heretofore rejected.

"Sec. 2. That in all cases where it shall appear to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Interior that any person has heretofore or shall hereafter make any payments to the United States under the public land laws in excess of the amount he was lawfully required to pay under such laws, such excess shall be repaid to such person or to his legal representatives: *Provided*, That such person or his legal representatives shall file a request for the repayment of such excess within two years after the patent has issued for the land embraced in such payment, or within two years from the passage of this act as to such excess payments as have heretofore been made.

"Sec. 3. That when the Commissioner of the General Land Office shall ascertain the amount of any excess moneys, purchase moneys, or commissions in any case where repayment is authorized by this statute, the Secretary of the Interior shall at once certify such amounts to the Secretary of the Treasury, who is hereby authorized and directed to make repayment of all amounts so certified out of any moneys not otherwise appropriated and issue his warrant in settlement thereof.

"Sec. 4. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper for the purpose of carrying the provisions of this act into full force and effect."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks for a division.

The House divided; and there were—yeas 33, noes 3.

So the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. SINNOTT, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title:

H. R. 9821. An act to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the Metropolitan police of the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1901, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 2961. An act authorizing the Chincoteague Toll Road & Bridge Co. (Inc.) a corporation created by, and existing under, the laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia, to construct certain bridges to connect Chincoteague Island and the mainland.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO WAIT ON THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, your committee, consisting of Messrs. JAMES W. GOOD, CLAUDE KITCHIN, and FRANK W. MONDELL, appointed by the House to join a like committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make, begs leave to report that the joint committee has performed its duty and that the President has notified us that he will have pleasure in sending a message in writing to the Congress to-morrow, December 2.

QUORUM.

Mr. WALSH rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Massachusetts rise?

Mr. WALSH. To make a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALSH. There is no quorum present.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his point for a moment?

Mr. WALSH. I will withhold it for a moment.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a unanimous-consent request that we take up for immediate consideration the House joint resolution 136, which is the Red Cross business.

Mr. WALSH. I did not withhold my point of order for that purpose.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 484) for the erection of a Federal office building on a site acquired for the Subtreasury at St. Louis, Mo.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I renew the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio makes the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. BAER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman allow me to make a request for unanimous consent?

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, December 2, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the president of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting statement showing expenses for travel of officers and employees of the Civil Service Commission from Washington to points outside of the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 305); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the president of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report of the official operations of that Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 423); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the president of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting report showing for the first four months of the fiscal year 1920 the average number of employees in each department receiving the increased compensation provided in section 7 of the legislative, executive, and judicial act approved March 1, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 306); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the president of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting report of the contingent expenses of the District of Columbia, fiscal year ended June 30,

1919 (H. Doc. No. 307); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the president of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting statement required by section 7, legislative act of March 1, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 308); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting data relative to exchange of typewriters and adding machines in part payment for new machines used for the same purposes as those exchanged by the Panama Canal for the period July 1, 1918, to June 30, 1919, such data having been furnished the Washington office of the Panama Canal (H. Doc. No. 309); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting data relative to the number of employees of the Washington office of the Panama Canal receiving increased compensation at the rate of \$240 per annum, and the average number by grades receiving the same at each other rate, during the first four months of the present fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 310); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the Public Printer, transmitting report of the average number of employees of the Government Printing Office to receive increased compensation at the rate of \$240 per annum and the average number by grades receiving the same at other rates (H. Doc. No. 311); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

9. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting detailed statement of expenditures under the contingent appropriations for the Navy Department for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 312); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department and ordered to be printed.

10. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting tentative draft of a bill entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others in the naval service of the United States for property lost or destroyed in such service (H. Doc. No. 313); to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

11. A letter from the president of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a statement showing the typewriters, adding machines, and other labor-saving devices exchanged in part payment for new machines during the fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 314); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

12. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting statement showing in detail what officers and employees of the War Department have traveled on official business from Washington to points outside of the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 315); to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department and ordered to be printed.

13. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, transmitting detailed statement of the expenditures made from the appropriation "Contingent expenses, Department of Labor, 1917," from November 8, 1918, to October 31, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 316); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Labor and ordered to be printed.

14. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Labor, transmitting statement showing number of arrests and causes therefor, the number of deportations effected and the causes therefor, the number of cases in which deportation was defeated, and the causes or grounds upon which deportation proceedings were undertaken (H. Doc. No. 317); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization and ordered to be printed.

15. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting statement of allowances authorized during the fiscal year 1919 payable from the appropriation for unusual conditions (H. Doc. No. 318); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department and ordered to be printed.

16. A letter from the Acting Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting a copy of the third annual report of the United States Tariff Commission (H. Doc. No. 319); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

17. A letter from the Superintendent of the United States Botanic Garden, transmitting statement regarding increased compensation paid employees under said office (H. Doc. No. 320); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

18. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the president of the National Forest Reservation Commission submitting an estimate of appropriation required by that department for the fiscal years 1921 to 1925, inclusive, together with a proposed draft of a bill (H. Doc. No. 321); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

19. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report showing each exchange of typewriters, adding machines, and other similar labor-saving devices during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 322); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

20. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Labor, transmitting statement of expenditures for the appropriation "Miscellaneous expenses, Bureau of Naturalization, 1917," during the fiscal year July 1, 1917, to June 30, 1918 (H. Doc. No. 323); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Labor and ordered to be printed.

21. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a statement of the proceeds of all sales of old material, condemned stores, supplies, and other public property for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 324); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

22. A letter from the superintendent of State, War, and Navy Buildings, transmitting report concerning employees of his office receiving increase of compensation (H. Doc. No. 325); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

23. A letter from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting statement of labor-saving devices exchanged in part payment for new machines during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 326); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

24. A letter from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting statement showing the travel of all officials and employees (other than special agents, inspectors, or employees who, in the discharge of their regular duties, are required to constantly travel) who have traveled on official business from Washington to points outside the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 327); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

25. A letter from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting a report showing the number of persons employed by the commission who received increased compensation for the months of July, August, September, and October, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 328); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

26. A letter from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting a statement of moneys appropriated for the valuation of carriers, and expenditures thereunder, to December 1, 1919, for the fiscal years 1913 to 1919, inclusive (H. Doc. No. 329); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

27. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a combined statement of the receipts and disbursements, balances, etc., of the Government during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 330); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

28. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a deficiency estimate of appropriations required by the United States Public Health Service for urgent emergency expenditures (H. Doc. No. 331); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

29. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required for postage for the Treasury Department, fiscal year 1920, additional to the sum provided in the legislative appropriation act of March 1, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 332); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

30. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Surgeon General, Public Health Service, submitting a report of expenditures from the appropriation "Preventing the spread of epidemic diseases" (H. Doc. No. 333); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department and ordered to be printed.

31. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Acting Secretary of War, furnishing statement of all moneys arising from proceeds of public property received by the War Department during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 334); to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department and ordered to be printed.

32. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required for additional clerical force for the office of the Auditor for the Treasury Department, fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 335); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

33. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the president of the Civil Service Commission, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the commission for printing and binding, fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 336); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

34. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a deficiency estimate of an appropriation required by the United States Public Health Service for an expenditure during the period from February 1 to July 1, 1920 (H. Doc. No. 337); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

35. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Surgeon General, Public Health Service, submitting a paragraph of legislation for inclusion in the next deficiency bill to be reported to Congress (H. Doc. No. 338); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

36. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation required by the Public Health Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920 (H. Doc. No. 339); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

37. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting required information regarding typewriting machines purchased and exchanged by the Post Office Department during the period from July 1, 1918, to June 30, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 340); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

38. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting statement of the appropriations, expenditures, and balances unexpended on account of the Postal Service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 341); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department and ordered to be printed.

39. A letter from the Public Printer, transmitting statement of typewriting machines purchased, exchanged, and repaired covering the period from July 1, 1918, to June 30, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 342); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

40. A letter from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, transmitting International Exchanges, Smithsonian Institution, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 343); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

41. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting report showing the average number of employees receiving the increased compensation at the rate of \$240 per annum and the average number by grades receiving the same at each other rate (H. Doc. No. 344); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

42. A letter from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, transmitting information regarding typewriting machines in which exchanges were made in part payment by the Government during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 345); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

43. A letter from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, transmitting statement of travel on official business for Smithsonian branches during fiscal year ended June 30, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 346); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

44. A letter from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, transmitting list of the employees who received the increased compensation at the rate of \$240 per annum, and the average number, by grades, who received the same at each other rate (H. Doc. No. 347); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

45. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting communication from the Surgeon General, Public Health Service, submitting a statement of the activities of the Public Health Service for the fiscal year 1919, and of expenditures therefor (H. Doc. No. 348); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department and ordered to be printed.

46. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimates of receipts of Indian tribal funds, expenditures recommended therefrom by the Secretary of the Interior for the benefit of Indians, and estimates of the amounts required to be expended under treaty stipulations and agreements, fiscal year ending June 30, 1921 (H. Doc. No. 349); to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

47. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting statement, as prepared by the Secretary of Agriculture, of number of persons employed in meat inspection, salary per diem, contingent expenses, etc., for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 350); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

48. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting list of claims on account of loss by fire, burglary, etc., acted upon by the Postmaster General, from July 1, 1918, to June 30, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 351); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department and ordered to be printed.

49. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting statement showing in detail what officers or employees (other than special agents, inspectors, or employees who in the discharge of their regular duties are required to constantly travel) traveled

on official business from Washington to points outside of the District of Columbia (H. Doc. No. 352); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department and ordered to be printed.

50. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting statement of refund to depositors on account of excess deposits, National Forest fund, fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 353); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

51. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a statement showing for the first four months of current fiscal year the average number of employees in the Department of Agriculture receiving increased compensation at the rate of \$240 per annum, and the average number by grades receiving the same at each other rate (H. Doc. No. 354); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

52. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting statement showing sums paid from the appropriations of the Bureau of Chemistry during the fiscal year 1919 for the compensation of, or payment of expenses of, officers or other persons employed by State, county, or municipal governments (H. Doc. No. 355); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

53. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting detailed report showing names of persons employed, their designations, rates of pay, etc., in the Bureau of Animal Industry, for the suppression of contagious diseases of domestic animals during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 356); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

54. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting statement of activities and expenditures in the department pertaining to the public health (H. Doc. No. 357); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

55. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting detailed statement showing places, quantity, and price of seeds purchased and the dates of purchase, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 358); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

56. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting annual report of appropriations under the Federal aid road act for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 359); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

57. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting statement from the various offices and bureaus of the Treasury Department showing what officers and employees performed travel on official business from Washington to points outside the District of Columbia, fiscal year ended June 30, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 360); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department and ordered to be printed.

58. A letter from the assistant clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting statement of all judgments rendered by the Court of Claims for the year ended November 29, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 361); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

59. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting statement of expenditures of the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 362); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

60. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting detailed report showing the publications received and distributed by the Department of Agriculture during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 363); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

61. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting report to Congress of claims adjusted under act of Congress approved March 2, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 364); to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department and ordered to be printed.

62. A letter from the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, transmitting annual report (H. Doc. No. 365); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

63. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting a list of reports to be made to Congress by public officers during the Sixty-sixth Congress (H. Doc. No. 366); to the Committee on Accounts and ordered to be printed.

64. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting report for the period from July 1, 1918, to June 30, 1919, inclusive (H. Doc. No. 417); to the Committee on Accounts and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 10736) defining the crime of criminal syndicalism and prescribing punishment therefor; to provide for the deportation of aliens and certain naturalized citizens upon conviction thereof; to prohibit the use of the mails for the promotion of criminal syndicalism; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 10737) prohibiting the manipulation of the prices of the necessities of life; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 10738) to provide for collective bargaining between employers and employees in all industries engaged in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 10739) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Oregon City, in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10740) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Marshfield, in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10741) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Astoria, in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10742) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Ashland, in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10743) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Grants Pass, in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10744) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Corvallis, in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10745) providing for the addition to the Federal building in Eugene, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GRIGSBY: A bill (H. R. 10746) to authorize the incorporation of town of Wrangell, Alaska, to issue bonds for the construction, enlargement, and equipment of schools, the acquisition and construction of a water-supply system, the construction of a sewer system, the construction of a city dock and a floating dock, and to levy and collect a special tax therefor; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 10747) to promote the efficiency of the permanent Military Establishment, and for the retirement of certain enlisted men who served as temporary officers during the war between United States and Germany; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 10748) providing for the removal of the remains of certain soldiers, sailors, and marines to the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES: Resolution (H. Res. 398) requesting the Secretary of State to furnish the House of Representatives certain information concerning the Siberian situation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KENDALL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 250) declaring November 11 of each year to be a national holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 251) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 10749) granting a pension to Mary A. Moessner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10750) granting an increase of pension to John Schoonover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEGG: A bill (H. R. 10751) granting a pension to Daniel Burkey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10752) granting a pension to Jennie O. Reed; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10753) granting an increase of pension to Lewis K. Allen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 10754) granting a pension to James S. Haggard; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10755) granting a pension to Joseph Tewell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 10756) granting a pension to Frank H. Howell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DEWALT: A bill (H. R. 10757) granting a pension to George Birch; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10758) granting a pension to Sarah E. Maurer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 10759) for the relief of Lizzie Askel; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HULINGS: A bill (H. R. 10760) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Kashner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 10761) for the relief of Oliver Lewis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10762) for the relief of Robert W. Vail; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10763) for the relief of George A. Cummings; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10764) for the relief of E. C. Adams; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10765) for the relief of Katherine Abel; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IRELAND: A bill (H. R. 10766) granting a pension to Ivar A. Amell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10767) granting a pension to Jean B. Kopf; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10768) granting a pension to Robert Hand; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10769) granting a pension to David O. Spencer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10770) granting a pension to Luella Covert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10771) granting an increase of pension to Perry Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 10772) granting a pension to Frank Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10773) granting a pension to Catherine Weber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 10774) granting a pension to Diana Lucas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 10775) granting an increase of pension to Peter T. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10776) granting an increase of pension to Solomon J. Grine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: A bill (H. R. 10777) granting a pension to John B. A. Richard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 10778) granting a pension to James M. Winston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEWTON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 10779) to correct the military record of William Kern; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OSBORNE: A bill (H. R. 10780) granting a pension to Jane Fine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10781) granting a pension to John R. Garstang; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10782) granting a pension to Robert M. Linton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10783) granting a pension to W. H. Johnston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10784) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Humphrey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10785) granting an increase of pension to Nancy F. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10786) granting a pension to Eugene F. Boyer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10787) for the relief of the Citizens' National Bank, of Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10788) for the relief of Austin G. Tainter; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 10789) granting an increase of pension to Annie Belle Guant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 10790) granting an increase of pension to Armstead Shain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10791) granting a pension to Alvis F. Ritter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 10792) granting an increase of pension to James P. Ritchie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10793) granting a pension to Arthur M. Rogers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAGUE: A bill (H. R. 10794) granting an increase of pension to Murray V. Livingstone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10795) granting a pension to James J. Barratt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10796) granting a pension to George J. Malloy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 10797) granting an increase of pension to John Sowers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WARD: A bill (H. R. 10798) granting a pension to Isabelle Monroe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10799) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Beach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 10800) granting a pension to Mary F. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10801) granting a pension to Mary Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 10802) granting a pension to Louisa J. V. Vaughn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of American Jewish Veterans' League of Pennsylvania, urging Congress to use the great moral influence of the United States of America in behalf of their unfortunate brethren of certain European countries, and more especially of Ukraine; to bring about a cessation of maltreatment, redress, and justice and punishment of the guilty, so that the great principle of freedom and democracy they so freely offered and gave their lives for may be truly vindicated; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of members of the Jewish Community of Springfield, Mass., entreating and requesting the United States Government that it may use its good offices and intercede in behalf of the Jews in Ukraine, that it may investigate the conditions existing there and subsequently censure the chief offenders before the tribunal of public opinion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of pastor and congregation of the Trinitarian Congregational Church of Northfield, Mass., urging support of the Williams resolution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of Rotary Club, Nowata, Okla., petitioning Congress to grant to all American Indians full rights of American citizenship and the abolishment of the Indian Bureau; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of members of Plymouth Brotherhood, of Worcester, Mass., respectfully but earnestly urging Congress to immediate action in extending to Armenia the leadership of our American Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of Woodstock Presbyterian Church, of New York City, urging Congress to amend the preamble of the national Constitution to read, in substance, as follows: We, the people of the United States, devoutly recognizing the authority and law of Jesus Christ, the Savior and King of nations, and desiring to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEGG: Petition of Perry Post, No. 83, American Legion, of Erie County, Ohio, urging enactment of laws curbing the activities of organizations and individuals which are un-American and seek to destroy the fundamentals of this Nation; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CRAMTON: Memorial of the board of supervisors of the county of Tuscola, Mich., for a tariff of 4 cents per pound upon Japanese or Manchurian beans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Hugh J. Clark and 25 other farmers, of the township of Dwight, Huron County, and of William D. Gamblyn and 186 other farmers, of the township of Meade, Huron County, Mich., for an increased tariff on foreign beans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of A. A. Smith and 15 other veterans of the Civil War for passage of the Fuller pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of Ninth Division of Railway Mail Association, for increase of salary for railway mail clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of Tara Club, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring rejection of the league of nations as now framed; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of New York, favoring six months' pay for soldiers and sailors who participated in the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, indorsing the principle of the Edge bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CURRY of California: Resolutions of the Sacramento Valley Development Association, urging the maintenance of viticultural equipment stations in California to ascertain what, if anything, can be done with wine grapes other than the manufacture of wine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Colona Parlor, No. 212, Native Daughters of the Golden West, of Sacramento, Calif., opposing oriental immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of Sacramento (Calif.) Post, No. 61, American Legion, against oriental, Japanese, and "picture brides" immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DARROW: Resolutions of Post 390, American Legion, Philadelphia, Pa., favoring legislation for the establishment of branch offices of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance; also to authorize the Government to lend service men \$4,000 for the purchase of homes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of Missouri Aeronautical Society of St. Louis, Mo., voicing sentiments regarding Senate bill 2693; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Hebrew Veterans of the Wars of the Republic, protesting against treatment being received by the Jewish population in Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of National Federation of Postal Clerks, Local No. 8; Bridge and Structural Iron Workers, Local No. 18, of St. Louis, Mo.; Glass Bottle Blowers' Association, of St. Louis; National Association of Letter Carriers, Branch 243; Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers, Local No. 6; St. Louis Label Trades Section; Railway Express Drivers, Chauffeurs, and Helpers; St. Louis Bookbinders' Union No. 18, all of St. Louis, Mo., opposing legislation and propaganda against the use of tobacco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Overall, Shirt, and White Goods Workers, Local 238, United Garment Workers of America, of St. Louis, Mo., opposing Cummins antistrike bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Resolutions adopted by the surviving Federal soldiers of Dekalb County, Tenn., for an increase of Civil War pensions; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of American citizens of Lithuanian origin of Chicago, Ill., for recognition by the United States of the independence of Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Black & White Lime Co., of Quincy, Ill., for the loan or sale of Army equipment to the Boy Scouts of America; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Western Central Association of Stove Manufacturers, opposing Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of United Mine Workers of America, District No. 17, Charleston, W. Va., asking appointment of a Federal commission to investigate conditions in southern West Virginia; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Illinois Valley Manufacturers' Club, for the adoption of the metric system of weights and measures; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, petition of the Rockford Real Estate Board, of Illinois, favoring House bill 8080; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Petition of Jewish residents of Fall River, Mass., protesting against the treatment being received by the Jewish population of Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KENDALL (by request): Petition of Somerset Post, No. 181, American Legion, Somerset, Pa., urging legislation which will deny the right of citizenship to all persons who are members of organizations requiring their members to refrain from military service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the district executive board of district 17, of the United Mine Workers of America, appealing to Congress to immediately take steps to protect the citizens of West Virginia in the part known as the Guyan field; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, indorsing the Edge bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of International Association of Railroad Supervisors of Mechanics, opposing the Esch bill and also the Cum-

mins bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Alabama State Federation of Labor, opposing the Cummins bill, the Esch-Pomerene bill, and urging support of the Sims bill, No. 10367; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Metal Polishers' Local Union No. 6, of Chicago, Ill., urging Congress to grant a complete amnesty to all political and industrial prisoners convicted under the espionage act and the repeal of all such laws as interfere with the moral exercise of the American liberties guaranteed under the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Hebrew Veterans of the Wars of the Republic, condemning the atrocities inflicted on the Jewish peoples in Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of members of the Tara Club, of Brooklyn, N. Y., congratulating the United States Senate on its action with the peace treaty, because it tends to guarantee the territorial integrity to Great Britain at the expense of America's sovereignty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts assembled in Tremont Temple and Faneuil Hall, Boston, on armistice day, November 11, 1919, urging relief to the suffering peoples of Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the real estate board of New York City, urging support of House bill 8080; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Federal Retirement Association of New York City, urging the passage of the Lehlbach bill, providing for the retirement of superannuated Federal employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of Adolph Lewisohn, of New York City, urging a standing army of not more than 250,000 men, a national militia made up of voluntary enlistments and no conscriptions, and nonmilitary athletic exercises in the schools and colleges; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Union of Technical Men, of New York City, opposing the Cummins bill or the enactment of any legislation which would destroy or impair the rights and freedom of the wage earners, whether they are railroad workers or others; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the board of directors of the Brooklyn Coal Exchange, urging the Interstate Commerce Commission to give the matter consideration and grant whatever relief may be possible in the case of the repudiation by the Railroad Administration of the agreement made last March with committees of the National Retail Coal Merchants' Association and other branches of the coal industry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHN W. RAINEX: Petition of the First Division Auxiliary, No. 1, American Expeditionary Forces, of Chicago, Ill., favoring bonus of \$360 to soldiers who served with the American Expeditionary Forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of International Association of Railroad Supervisors of Mechanics, asking for creation of a special board or tribunal to hear industrial grievances of minor officials in railroad service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of executive board of district No. 17, United Mine Workers of America, appealing, on behalf of 40,000 organized miners, that Congress immediately send a special commission into the Guyan coal field in southern West Virginia to investigate and report upon alleged numerous acts of violence by private guards and gunmen against coal miners and their wives and children; also the denial of civil and industrial rights to the coal miners by coal operators in this field; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, petition of Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America, at Portal, N. Dak., protesting against proposed legislation against strikes, declaring that "organized labor refuses to go back to the days of involuntary servitude," and urging retention for at least two more years of Government control, asserting that "private corporations could not run the roads for one cent cheaper, and in fact we know that corporation officials to a large extent have not exerted themselves to make a success of the administration"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VARE: Petition of Presbyterian Ministerial Association of Philadelphia, asking the continuation of the moral safety zones in the vicinity of navy yards in time of peace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Grand Lodge, Order of Elks, asking passage of House bill 1412; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Pennsylvania State Federation of Labor, protesting against passage of the Cummins bill with the antistrike clause; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Pennsylvania State Federation of Labor, protesting against the arrest of Hindus coming to this country; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, December 2, 1919.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thy servants have been called together in the Senate to give direction to the public policy of this great Nation. The problems that confront us challenge the wisest statesmanship of all the ages. The world is in the remaking. The forces of civilization lie plastic in our hands. We pause at the beginning of the great work committed to our hands to invoke the divine blessing. Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet, lest we forget; lest we forget. May wisdom preside over our councils. May brotherly love prevail. May the unity of purpose and spirit of this body be to us the prophecy of the successful issue of our great spiritual enterprise. For Christ's sake. Amen.

OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD, a Senator from the State of Alabama; DAVID I. WALSH, a Senator from the State of Massachusetts; JOSIAH O. WOOLCOTT, a Senator from the State of Delaware; LEE S. OVERMAN, a Senator from the State of North Carolina; JOHN WALTER SMITH, a Senator from the State of Maryland; and ALBERT B. FALL, a Senator from the State of New Mexico, appeared in their seats to-day.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

LETTER FROM MISS LUCY DAY MARTIN.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the following letter from Miss Lucy Day Martin, which will be read. The Secretary read as follows:

UNIVERSITY, VA.

HON. THOMAS R. MARSHALL,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I wish personally to express to you and the Members of the Senate the deep gratitude of the family of the late Senator MARTIN for your recent very profound manifestation of affection and esteem for my father.

We shall ever hold this tribute and the expression of sympathy for the family in most grateful remembrance.

Very sincerely, yours,

LUCY DAY MARTIN.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. LODGE and Mr. HITCHCOCK, the committee appointed on the part of the Senate, appeared, and Mr. LODGE said:

Mr. President, the committee which was appointed yesterday to notify the President that the Senate was organized and prepared to receive any communication he might be pleased to make presented the notification at the White House, and I send the following reply to the desk to be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 1, 1919.

GENTLEMEN: The President has asked me to thank you for the courtesy of your letter of December 1, notifying him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication which he may be pleased to make. The President will have pleasure in sending a message in writing to the Congress to-morrow, December 2.

Sincerely, yours,

JOSEPH P. TUMULTY,
Secretary to the President.

HON. H. C. LODGE,
HON. G. M. HITCHCOCK,
HON. F. W. MONDELL,
HON. JAMES W. GOOD, and
HON. CLAUDE KITCHIN,

Washington, D. C.

SENATOR FROM VIRGINIA.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the following credentials, which will be read.